INSTITUT FRANÇAIS DE L'ÉDUCATION
AGENCE QUALITÉ ÉDUCATION

n° 64
Sept. 2011

Contents

CURRENT LITERATURE REVIEW IN EDUCATION

You are reading a literature review compiled by members of Veille & Analyses, a department of the French Institute of Education within the higher education institution ENS Lyon. We analyse research literature and activities throughout scientific and institutional productions in education in order to map out key research trends on current topics and produce states of the art in the educational research field.

LEARNING HOW TO TEACH IN HIGHER EDUCATION : A MATTER OF EXCELLENCE

By Laure Endrizzi

Research associate French Institute of Education (IFÉ)

Higher education teaching is a very different matter from secondary teaching. One major difference is that there is generally no obligation to undergo formal training to work in higher education. The identity of the profession is also primarily a matter of allegiance to a particular discipline: academics are researchers first, teachers second. The assumption is that being a good researcher with a particular expertise is enough to be a good teacher (Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009). In short, informal training is the dominant approach in current professional development practices. In other words, it is by teaching that one learns to teach (Knight *et al.*, 2006).

However, a number of recent initiatives aimed at promoting pedagogical excellence have served to challenge the established order by focusing on '**pedagogical development**'. The aim of these initiatives is to provide training and/or support to higher education staff as part of their teaching duties (lesson preparation and delivery, development of programs, organization of teaching, assessment, etc).

Today, there is evidence of a trend toward professionalization – a trend encouraged by institutions rather than teachers and driven for the most part by specialized centers in higher education institutions. However, these are mostly local initiatives involving little or no inter-institutional coordination – and in some cases little coordination within the same department. As such, they lack visibility, making it difficult to structure and organize university teaching (Romainville & Rege Colet, 2006). To this extent, the book by Romainville and Donnay entitled *Enseigner à l'université: un* métier qui *s'apprend* (1996) has never been more relevant.

The purpose of this study is to provide an overview of the main lines of thought in Europe and North America on the question of pedagogical development based on the recent literature. After an introductory section on the evolution of the higher education teaching profession, the study presents the main models of pedagogical development, before examining current support mechanisms for new university staff and good practices in the area of continuing training. The study will conclude by focusing on the emergence of educational development centers and by outlining the main approaches to change in this area.

HIGHER EDUCATION TEACHING : A CHANGING PROFESSION

THE DEMAND FOR EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

Higher education has undergone unprecedented changes over the last 30 years, as shown by various studies by UNESCO (Global University Network for Innovation or GUNI) and the OECD (Institutional Management in Higher Education programme or IMHE). The image of universities as places exclusively devoted to knowledge production has changed, and **the primacy of research over teaching is increasingly becoming a matter of debate**.

These changes are part of a movement toward educational and pedagogical innovation – a trend promoted in Europe by the Bologna process and driven by the massification of higher education and by the increased social pressure on higher education institutions to ensure that the skills and knowledge they provide meet the needs of society (Romainville & Rege Colet, 2006).

At a meso level, the significant impact of ICT in higher education has contributed to promoting student-centered teaching models (Langevin *et al.*, 2007), while at a micro level, the inherent tensions of the higher education profession have reignited the debate over research and teaching (Musselin, 2008).

In Europe, new questions surrounding the quality of teaching emerged in the 1990s, notably with the creation of the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE). The publication of the Dearing Report (United Kingdom, 1997) was another major landmark: for the first time, an official report explicitly challenged the link commonly made between excellence in research and excellence in teaching (Fanghanel & Trowler, 2007).

The perception of a close link between teaching and learning – a view held by a number of English-speaking scholars (Säljo, Entwistle, Ramsden, Prosser, Trigwell) and promoted in French-speaking Europe by authors such as Rege Colet and Romainville – favored the emergence of teaching resource centers and professional teacher development (de Ketele, 2010).

More recently, in the mid-2000s, the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA) addressed the question of excellence in teaching by defining guidelines for quality assurance management in European higher education (ENQA, 2005).

A recent study by the OECD (Hénard, 2010) identified a number of initiatives aimed at promoting teaching quality in member countries while emphasizing their empirical (and even experimental) nature. According to Hénard, the consolidation of these initiatives involves a range of measures, including support for the initiatives taken by the teaching profession.

These new directions represent a major challenge for higher education institutions. How should we define quality? What makes a good lesson? What makes a good teacher? It is not enough merely to assess outcomes; it is also important to focus on processes. In addition to the quality of teaching, it is also important to focus on questions related to the quality of teachers, including selection and promotion criteria, initial and continuing teacher training, and profiles of innovators in teaching (Parmentier, 2006). Recent research suggests that quality assurance and assessment provide a lever to promote the professional development of higher education teachers.

> *'Encouraging bottom-up initiatives from the faculty members, setting tbem in a propitious learning and teaching environment, providing effective support and stimulating reflection on the role of teaching in the learning process all contribute to the quality of teaching'*
> (Hénard, 2010)

ACADEMIA: AN IMMUTABLE PROFESSION?

One career, many activities

One of the most notable trends in higher education is the changing face of the academic profession (Ender, 2001; Rey, 2005; Altbach *et al.*, 2009).

One of the main features of this trend is the increasing diversity and complexity of professional responsibilities, which are widely perceived as becoming increasingly heavy (Losego, 2004). As part of this global movement, there has also been a shift in values. Some have bemoaned the fact that research practices appear to be giving way to administrative (and even bureaucratic) responsibilities (Faure *et al.*, 2005), while others have noted that the tendency to base undergraduate courses on a secondary education model has simply been superimposed on the existing academic culture (Bourgin, 2011). Alongside these developments, research leadership has become increasingly centralized at the expense of departments, resulting in tensions between disciplinary culture and managerial culture (Paradeise & Lichtenberger, 2009).

For all these reasons, efforts to relieve academics of their teaching responsibilities have become a burning issue for many governments. The expansion of recruitment to include temporary staff is common practice in many countries, although it is less common in France than in other European countries (Schwartz, 2008; MEN, 2011). However, access to a career in higher education remains firmly rooted in national traditions. Despite the increasing tendency of institutions to impose a regulatory framework from above, university departments have retained their dominance, while the assessment of teaching skills and candidate personality has yet to be standardized (Musselin, 2008).

'The predominance of the values of individual autonomy and academic specialization leads to an atomization of the curriculum and to professional isolation'
(Dill, 2003).

In France, there is no formal training system for higher education staff, although the services provided by the CIES (*Centres d'Initiation à l'Enseignement Supérieur*) can (or could) be viewed as a form of initial training, while those provided by the SUP (*Services Universitaires de Pédagogie*) can be seen as a form of continuing training.

The idea of officially recognizing activities not directly related to research, as recommended by a number of official reports (Espéret, 2001; Schwartz, 2008), has struggled to make headway in recent years (Losego, 2004) – as shown by the protests triggered by the décret sur le statut des enseignants-chercheurs published in the *Journal Officiel* of 25/04/2009, which explicitly called for a flexible system aimed at adapting the number of teaching hours to the workload of each staff member.

Teaching and the promotion of more 'active' practices

However, recent changes in the landscape of higher education teaching (notably the issue of quality assurance) have resulted in the emergence of an explicit teaching role or status and the development of more diverse and more active teaching practices. Higher education teachers are increasingly seen '*as creators of stimulating learning environments, as mentors and aides*' (Langevin *et al.*, 2008).

Despite these developments, in most higher education institutions, teaching remains an isolated and largely uncoordinated activity. There are many potential conflicts limiting the possibility of collective reflection on teaching and pedagogy (Coulon & Paivandi, 2008), and individual disciplines retain their imprint since researchers in different areas tend to have different views of research and teaching and different working methods (Becquet & Musselin, 2004).

Despite some resistance, there have been major changes in teaching practices over the last ten years, including the increasing use of active methods (project-based learning, prob-

lem-based learning), the emergence of vocational 'skill-based' degrees, and the development of interdisciplinary undergraduate programs (Annoot & Fave-Bonnet, 2004; Romainville & Rege Colet, 2006).

In Anglo-American research, the links between teaching and learning have been widely debated and discussed. While the analysis of practices has developed significantly in recent years, an increasingly wide range of research areas have also emerged. Some focus on the generic tasks of teaching (Light *et al.*, 2009), while others have developed typologies based on the pedagogical approaches used by teachers, such as the '*Approaches to Teaching Inventory*' by Trigwell & Prosser (2004). Other interests include the influence of discipline-specific environments and teaching contexts (Kreber, 2009).

While there is a large literature on the views and practices of higher education teachers, research on educational and pedagogical development remains limited. Learning to teach is still a taboo for higher education teachers, and the idea of training and support is often seen as a sign of either de-professionalization or professionalization. Today, **the promotion of teaching represents a major challenge** for higher education institutions (Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009).

CONCEPTIONS AND APPROACHES TO TEACHING

A distinction is commonly made between two types of approaches: first, a 'content-based' and 'teacher-centered' approach, where students are seen as passive receivers of the knowledge (content) transmitted by the teacher; and, second, a 'learning-based' and 'student-centered' approach, where teachers focus on facilitating learning. Most teachers use both approaches, adapting their practices to suit the context (Postareff & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2008).

Assessing the effectiveness of an approach is a complex issue, although there is some pressure to prefer active methods (Ramsden, 2003). However, **the impact of representations on practices** has been well-established in research (Trigwell & Prosser, 2004; Langevin *et al.*, 2007). Many studies have shown that the disciplinary context and the work environment play a key role in shaping teaching practices (Boyer & Coridian, 2002; Lindblom-Ylänne, 2006).

Several factors can determine conceptions of teaching. For example, young temporary teaching staff seeking for a career in research, teachers with no previous experience and teachers working in scientific and technical disciplines tend to have a teacher-centered and lecture-based approach to teaching and are more concerned about subject knowledge than student support (Demougeot-Lebel & Perret, 2010a and 2010b).

The role of emotions, particularly self-confidence, has also been emphasized in recent research. Teachers with a 'learning-centered' profile tend to be more confident and to have a more positive view of teaching, and have also been found to be more prone to self-reflection. By contrast, teachers with a 'content-based' profile are more likely to have neutral or negative views. Lastly, the views of teachers at the beginning of their career tend to be less clear (Sadler, 2008; Trigwell, 2009; Postareff & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2011).

By contrast, others have shown that the use of so-called active methods is not attributable to particular teacher profiles or even linked to a particular discipline or context (Stes *et al.*, 2007).

'The knowledge to be taught draws on the discipline of reference (the main source of professional identity), while teaching skills are based on a form of implicit knowledge acquired through teaching activities but also within disciplines'
(Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009)

In this review, the term 'pedagogical development' will be used to refer to all teaching-related activities (lessons, programs, organization), while the term 'professional development' will be used to refer to the various aspects of a career in academia.

TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS

Teachers' representations of professional development vary widely. In the hierarchy of needs expressed by teachers, training comes third after time and peer support and the updating of knowledge (Langevin, 2008).

Training needs vary according to age, sex, seniority and discipline. For example, in scientific and medical disciplines, training needs tend to focus on ICTs, while the arts and humanities focus to a greater extent on building relationships with students. Beyond these variations, **teachers generally expect training to be relevant to their practices and tend to see pedagogical knowledge primarily as an empirical matter** (Beney & Pentecouteau, 2008).

Some studies have reported a more instrumental approach among new entrants to the profession, who tend to focus on practical issues in seeking to develop a repertoire of techniques (Åkerlind, 2007; Beney & Pentecouteau, 2008). Other studies have shown that the difficulties reported by new entrants are similar to those encountered by more senior staff (Langevin, 2007; Demougeot-Lebel & Perret, 2011).

In a study conducted on teacher training needs at the University of Dijon (France), two priorities were clearly identified: interactive lectures and active pedagogical methods. The intervention strategies referred to by the participants were found to be relatively traditional (workshops, conferences, seminars). However, the study found that just 40% of participants were prepared to devote one to two days per year to pedagogical development (Demougeot-Lebel & Perret, 2011).

MODELS OF PEDAGOGICAL DEVELOPMENT

- The literature on the professional development of higher education teachers raises many questions, including:
  - Should there be a compulsory qualification to enter the profession or to secure tenure? Should continuing training be made statutory?
  - Should we adopt a formal system based on a more or less open program, or should we opt instead for a more informal approach designed merely to give direction and guidance?
  - Should we opt for unique, isolated interventions or for a program spread over time?
  - Should we promote a top-down or a bottom-up approach (based on staff needs) to promote personalized support?
  - Should training address a collection of individuals or should pedagogical development be approached from a collective perspective?
  - Should we specifically target new and temporary staff, who tend to be heavily involved in undergraduate teaching?

  Should we adopt a discipline-based approach by bringing teachers of the same subject together, or should we adopt multi- and cross-disciplinary models that take into account the 'didactics' of different disciplines?
  - Should we use a frame of reference that defines the skills of a 'good teacher', or should we develop a frame of reference that takes into account all of the various aspects of the academic profession?
  - What structures need to be in place? - What should their objectives be? To promote training provision and guidance (support and accompaniment)? To incorporate a research component?

- Who should be responsible for pedagogical development: academic advisors, education researchers, peers, or innovation professionals? Who should be involved in the assessment of teaching? What type of professionalization should we promote among academic advisors?
- What links should be developed between pedagogical development activities and career development (granting of tenure and promotion)? Should we create different statuses to determine the career path of higher education staff based on their actual investment?

The point here is not to answer these questions but to show that they are legitimate issues (in both professional and academic settings) and that they have generated original lines of thought outside France.

SOME TERMINOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL CLARIFICATIONS

A grounding in the ever-expanding terminology of educational development is necessary in order to understand research in this area. The interpretive framework provided by Taylor and Rege Colet (2010) is an invaluable resource in this respect.

According to Taylor and Rege Colet (2010), it is important to distinguish between 'instructional development', which focuses on improving lessons, and 'curriculum development' and 'organizational development'. 'Instructional development' also differs from 'professional development', which encompasses all the activities of higher education staff, while the terms 'faculty development' and 'academic development' incorporate the professional and organizational dimensions of the profession (the second term is mostly used in North America). These concepts are all included in the umbrella term 'educational development'.

Pedagogical development can take a variety of forms, ranging from informal to formal approaches. Examples of more formal approaches include development programs imposed by institutions (Langevin *et al.*, 2007; Saroyan & Frenay, 2010). Pedagogical development can also have different objectives. For example, the University of Helsinki recently developed a strategic plan aimed at promoting the adoption of more openly active teaching practices (Postareff *et al.*, 2008), while a recent experiment conducted in Bern explicitly aims to familiarize academics with 'subject-specific pedagogical skills' (Berthiaume & Chevalier, 2008).

The first structuring principles emerged in the 1990s based on the assumption that professional training needs to be continuing and to involve interaction with peers, and must also be incorporated as part of teaching practice. In parallel, the American SoTL movement, which we will return to in the next section, has prepared the ground for a reconciliation of teaching and research by promoting a kind of meta-profession. After a decade of operationalization, this particular view of expertise in teaching now plays a major role in shaping initiatives aimed at the professional development of academics (Langevin *et al.*, 2008).

With the SoTL, the spectrum of interventions has widened to include not only teachers and professionals, but also experts in teaching and learning. Despite strong resistance, provision has developed significantly over the last 30 years, particularly in English-speaking countries, moving from an additive to a transformative model. In the additive model, the approach tends to be teaching-centered and activities are simply juxtaposed. The focus tends to be on techniques to be applied. The transformative approach is more complex and more closely linked to practice and tends to focus on learning; in the transformative model, interventions take into account previous knowledge, promote social interaction and emphasize the meaning and purpose of learning (Langevin *et al.*, 2008).

SOTL: FORMALIZING EXPERTISE IN TEACHING

The foundations of the SoTL (Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) were laid in the early 1990s by the American scholar Ernest Boyer, who described the academic profession based on four types of expertise, including teaching (1997).

Langevin *et al.* (2007) suggested translating 'SoTL' as 'expertise en matière d'enseignement / apprentissage' ('expertise in teaching and learning').

Today, the SoTL is a broad movement, or more precisely a range of movements, based on well-established national and international networks, including the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) in the United States, the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) in Canada, and the Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) in Australia. In addition to publishing journals and holding conferences, these networks are also members of the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (ISSoTL).

Despite these developments, some see the concept as fuzzy and controversial (Boshier, 2009), while others see it as more promising. This divergence of opinion can be explained by the wide range of applications of the concept. At the very heart of the SoTL lies an approach to academic work that seeks to reconcile research, teaching and student learning (Hubball & Burt, 2006).

According to Langevin *et al.* (2007), the SoTL has enabled the emergence of a new professional position combining a theoretical perspective, self-reflective practice and action research.

With the SoTL, the aim is to show that teaching complies with the same demands, criteria and standards as research.

The approach involves 'theorized collective action' – i.e. all teachers are potential researchers and take responsibility for defining their professionalization (Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009).

According to Kreber (2002), the SoTL is the final stage in the professional development of teachers (after excellence and expertise). At this final stage, teachers share their knowledge in ways that lend themselves to peer assessment and review. However, the approach is not based on traditional empirical research. According to Prosser and Trigwell (Prosser, 2008), the SoTL involves a form of critical reflection that has affinities with evidence-based research. In other words, the aim for teachers is to provide evidence of the effectiveness of their teaching.

In a useful approach, the quality of teaching is considered to be closely linked to specific disciplines. The SoTL draws on three types of motivation that are intrinsically linked: teachers are rewarded, they *feel* rewarded and they subscribe to the idea of acting in the interests of students. In other words, the aim is not to promote career progression (and thereby encourage a form of recognition of teaching) so much as to focus on the success of students (Kreber, 2007).

ACADEMICIZING TEACHING SKILLS

There is a widespread consensus in the research community that pedagogical development needs to be innovative and must be based on a multidimensional approach to global quality improvement (Grocia, 2010).

For example, according to Saroyan *et al.* (2006), a number of factors need to be considered: teachers' conceptions of teaching and pedagogy, the nature of university teaching (focused on learning), the teaching context and the potentially catalyzing role of the institution in promoting

teaching, and the model of teaching expertise, centering on self-reflective capacities. Based on these components, the proposed model (Frenay *et al.*, 2010 ; Saroyan & Frenay, 2010) is articulated around five main areas: scope and context (national, institutional, disciplinary), principles, values and codes of conduct, pedagogical development services, the expertise of academic advisors, and impact assessment.

According to Rege Colet and Berthiaume (2009), pedagogical development in the area of teaching skills depends primarily on the disciplinary rootedness of the skills used by teachers and on research carried out on these skills. In their model, 'subject-specific pedagogical skills' combine pedagogical and didactic skills with a 'personal epistemology'. The assumption is that teaching skills become more professional by becoming more academic and by being made public in the same way as strictly discipline-specific research (associations, networks, journals, conferences).

> *The aim of professionalization is to help teachers to move from implicit (unconscious) individual knowledge and skills to explicit (conscious) knowledge and skills within a community of practice, based on skills and knowledge derived from both experience and research. The process is thus experiential*
>
> (Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009)

PROVISION FOR NEW UNIVERSITY STAFF

TRAINING OR SUPPORTING ENTRY INTO THE PROFESSION

There are two conflicting views on the issue of entry into the academic profession, including the issue of determining whether teaching should be isolated from other aspects of the job (Smith, 2010): (1) local practices promoting an informal learning approach (Knight *et al.*, 2006) and emphasizing the importance of 'learning by doing' (Sadler, 2008) in a favorable environment, based on strong departmental leadership (Trowler & Knight, 2000); and 2) a formal program based on a more theoretical conception of pedagogical development, conceived as a compulsory or non-compulsory condition for entering the profession or securing tenure and under the responsibility of a central body within the institution (Prosser *et al.*, 2006; Postareff *et al.*, 2007 and 2008).

The notion of compulsory training as part of the professional training and recognition of higher education teachers has been actively supported by a number of professional associations (SEDA in the United Kingdom and HERDSA in Australia and New Zealand).

In short, the debate over teacher training remains open. Some countries have already introduced training as part of the tenure process (Australia, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom), while in other countries the issue of training provision is left to the discretion of institutions (Finland, Netherlands, New Zealand, United States). These developments may include specific provision for temporary teachers, recognized as full-fledged members of the teaching team (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Trowler & Bamber, 2005; Luzeckyj & Badger, 2008; Postareff *et al.*, 2008; Hicks *et al.*, 2010). In other countries, the focus

is also (and more specifically) on doctoral student training, as is the case in the Netherlands (Ender, 2005) and France (Moguérou, 2003).

As yet, there is no evidence of the effectiveness of one approach compared to another, since different approaches can facilitate the cultural integration of new staff.

THE FRENCH CIES: A LIMITED EXPERIMENT

In 1989, the Jospin Ministry created 14 CIES (*Centres d'Initiation à l'Enseignement Supérieur*). Their main purpose was to provide professional training and to coordinate provision for doctoral students with the *allocataire-moniteur* status. Until 2009, training was based around a common core covering the main aspects of the academic profession. The system provided training to 40,000 doctoral students over a period of 20 years at a rate of 10 training days a year over 3 years (Peretti, 2009).

The fact that the CIES were designed to provide training before entry into the profession is problematic: half of those who received training opted for a career outside academia, while half of all recruited academics received no training at all (Adangnikou & Paul, 2008). However, the *monitorat* system was also a springboard to a permanent job in academia (Moguérou, 2003).

However, the suppression of the *allocataire-moniteur* system in 2009 undermined the very existence of the CIES, thereby weakening the only formal mechanism for training future higher education teachers. With the new doctoral contract, there has been a shift from centralized to decentralized management, with the responsibility now lying with higher education institutions or PRES rather than the state (Peretti, 2009).

While many criticisms have been leveled against these centers by external actors, the principle of teacher training was not challenged by doctoral students (with the exception of *normaliens*). *Allocataires* were overwhelmingly in favor of teaching (64 hours per year) and were, by extension, in favor of close links between research and teaching. They were particularly attached to the cross-disciplinarity, multidisciplinarity, and neutrality of the system. Overall, there was a preference for lessons focusing on technical content rather than pedagogy. By contrast, the planned system of tutorial supervision in connection with teaching staff was considered to be largely deficient (Moguérou, 2003; Peretti, 2009; Paivandi, 2010).

According to Paivandi (2010), two factors undermined the *monitorat* system: the lack of intellectual interest of students and, above all, the lack of any space of mediation to discuss pedagogical issues within departments. In short, the experiment highlighted the lack of coordinated effort and the individual nature of pedagogical activities, a point emphasized by Musselin (2008).

THE LIMITATIONS OF PURELY LOCAL INITIATIVES

In their literature review, Luzeckyj and Badger (2008) noted that many countries consider initial training programs to be important because of the changes affecting higher education institutions, particularly the increasing emphasis on accountability.

There are several models or theories for defining the objectives of pedagogical training (Bamber, 2008). However, judging by the cases of Sweden and Britain, their implementation has been uneven, since the specific modalities of training (a requirement for obtaining tenure) are left to the discretion of individual institutions (Lindberg-Sand & Sonesson, 2008; Smith, 2011).

'(...) Training at the CIES is deemed by allocataires-moniteurs to be significantly better than the training received in IUFMs, and also better than the training received in doctoral schools (particularly in the case of practical courses). Criticisms (...) come not from allocataires-moniteurs so much as from external parties who have a mistaken view of the content of training and who adopt a position of principle on the importance of providing training adapted to the requirements of each discipline. These positions are remote from the immediate concerns of allocataires-moniteurs' (Peretti, 2009).

In response to the diversity of training courses developed as part of the Swedish program Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training (CHETT), some researchers have called for a more constraining national policy based on a 10-week training program including the SoTL perspective, with the aim of effecting a change in practices, both individual and collective (Lindberg-Sand & Sonesson, 2008).

In the United Kingdom, research suggests that the impact of programs such as the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (PGCLTHE) varies widely. While disciplinary affiliation does not appear to influence views one way or the other, a lack of transparency in the tenure-granting process and discrepancies between training and initial experiences within departments appear to be key factors (Smith, 2011).

Research also suggests that if the workload prevents or limits participation in training, if the local academic culture is not favorable to training programs and if new teachers have limited opportunities to exchange with colleagues, the overall impact of the system will be significantly reduced (Luzeckyj & Badger, 2008).

Making teacher training compulsory can be worthy if it is not an isolated measure and if there is a favourable structural and cultural environment.

(Trowler & Bamber, 2005)

LONG-TERM TRAINING

While the impact of teacher training at the beginning of the career varies slightly from one discipline to another (Stes *et al.*, 2010b), the individual benefits tend to vary widely and are heavily influenced by the length of the training period (Postareff *et al.*, 2007 and 2008).

The study by Gibbs and Coffey (2004) was one of the first meta-analyses aimed at assessing the impact of training on teaching practices. Their study showed that trained teachers become more receptive to active teaching methods after 4 to 18 months of training and that, as a result, students tend to develop a less superficial approach to learning.

Research also indicates that teachers who undergo training over at least a one-year period (30 ECTS or more) see an increase in their sense of personal efficacy and begin to change their practices by developing an approach more focused on student learning. Teachers who undergo shorter training programs appear to be less aware of themselves as teachers and to be more uncertain about their role than prior to training (Postareff *et al.*, 2007).

Based on their sample, Postareff *et al.* (2008) showed that those who had undergone a short training program saw an increase in their sense of personal efficacy over time – an indication of the deferred impact of training. Those who underwent another training program after the initial training program continued to develop methods more focused on learning.

The aim of training thus has more to do with a shift in conceptions than a change in teaching methods.

(Postareff *et al.*, 2008)

THE IMPORTANCE OF A FAVORABLE ENVIRONMENT

The available research suggests that the influence of the department at the beginning of the career is key to reducing uncertainty (Smith, 2010) and that conceptions of teaching are the product of a complex construct marked by a tension between research and teaching (Fanghanel, 2007; Norton *et al.*, 2010).

French research on the *monitorat* system has confirmed these findings. Almudever *et al.* (2001) showed that experience as an *allocataire-moniteur* (including training in the CIES) does not systematically reduce the sense of uncertainty at the beginning of a career in academia. According to Paivandi (2010), doctoral recipients automatically find themselves in a difficult position of in-betweenness – a position symptomatic of the tensions at the heart of the crisis affecting the French university system.

Allocataires-moniteurs find themselves caught *'between a commitment to research and a commitment to teaching; between the views of older university professors and those of CIES trainers; between the norms and values of the academic world and the norms and values of the student world'* (Paivandi, 2010).

In a favorable environment, the positive impact of **mentoring** at the beginning of the career has been demonstrated by many studies. However, there is no definitive evidence on the most effective system to adopt (i.e. formal or informal *mentorat*) nor on the **best way of organizing mentoring pairs**. By contrast, research suggests that the interpersonal skills and commitment of mentors are more important than their expertise in teaching (Bernatchez *et al.*, 2010). Sadler (2008) showed that interactions with students have the greatest impact on teaching practices at the beginning of the career.

Another approach involves promoting **project-based learning**. This is the approach recommended by Learn-Nett. For over 10 years, Learn-Nett has sought to ensure that future teachers are able to work in a team and to take charge of their own professional development by introducing them to ICTs. Learn-Nett is based on systematic tutor training, with tutors forming an active community of practice (Lebrun *et al.*, 2008).

To what extent can project-based teaching be viewed as being sufficiently facilitating to be formally included in the training of new teachers? This was the question raised by Balme *et al.* (2010), who demonstrated the positive impact of teaching the PPE module (PPE: *projet personnel de l'étudiant*) on teaching strategies, provided it is practiced for more than a year.

Lastly, another viable alternative is the development of a **community of practice** inspired by faculty learning communities (or FLCs) (Cox & Richlin, 2004). An experiment conducted at the University of Glasgow among university teachers (teachers who commit contractually to participate in action research) aimed to facilitate acculturation, including a greater sense of membership, greater self-confidence, more varied practices and, ultimately, a more positive view of the approach, largely inspired by the SoTL (MacKenzie *et al.*, 2010). To ensure that theory and practice are closely linked, Hubball and Burt identified a wide range of strategies – institutional, curricular, etc. – aimed at integrating the SoTL in a certifying or recognized training course (Hubball & Burt, 2006).

Ultimately, programs at the beginning of the career must take into account the previous experience of participants and must include several objectives, including integrating a pedagogy-based approach to teaching, promoting a 'scientific' practice of teaching, promoting exchanges and networking, and helping staff to understand the specificities of the local institutional context (Hicks *et al.*, 2010).

'CONTINUING TRAINING': FROM THEORY TO BEST PRACTICES

At present, there is little or no continuing training in European universities. While a number of initiatives have been developed in higher education institutions to provide services resembling a form of continuing training, participation is optional and is generally not taken into account in career promotion. Would making continuing training compulsory have a positive effect on teaching practices (Tudor, 2006)?

Although they have yet to answer this question, researchers have risen to the challenge of identifying and validating the most effective strategies for developing appropriate service provision.

MULTIPLE AND POTENTIALLY CONFLICTING PRACTICES

A number of principles for the development of a pedagogical development policy have already been identified. Debates over criteria in this area have tended to focus on a number of tensions, including: formal vs. informal, long vs. short training, isolated vs. continuing, and cross-disciplinary vs. subject-specific. However, studies in this area do not always provide a definitive answer to these questions.

For some, traditional interventions (training) achieve slightly better results than alternative initiatives (mentoring, awards, action research, etc.) (Stes *et al.*, 2010a). Others have called for training based on self-reflective and contextualized practice, where teachers are viewed as masters of their own approach (Romainville, 2009). For others, professional development is more the result of informal activities: the assumption is that skills are developed in the very act of teaching, by engaging with colleagues and students, and through personal reading (Bernatchez *et al.*, 2010).

For some, provision needs to focus on short tailored programs to avoid overloading teachers (Romainville, 2009). While several studies have highlighted the impact of long training programs at the beginning of the career (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Postareff *et al.*, 2007 and 2008), others have found that local interventions based on a continuing training system are less effective than longer-term interventions or interventions involving repeated training sessions (Stes *et al.*, 2010a).

While subject-specific training and interventions are considered to be crucial (Kreber, 2009; Rege Colet & Berthiaume, 2009), Stes *et al.* (2010a) were unable to provide a definitive answer to the question of the target audience in their literature review, since resources aimed at teachers in a specific subject appear to be no more effective than those based on a non-disciplinary approach.

In any case, there appears to be a consensus that a multidimensional approach is preferable. It is important to ensure that pedagogical models are not normative (Parmentier, 2006) and that provision meets the specific requirements of the academic world and its professional development practices (Romainville, 2009). In practice, the chosen approach needs to combine top-down and bottom-down approaches (Beney & Pentecouteau, 2008).

> *The aim is to promote a global 'intentional' approach, regardless of the proposed modalities.*
>
> (Knight *et al.*, 2006)

THE CASE FOR AN EXPERIENTIAL APPROACH TO CONTINUING TRAINING

From the support of (individual) projects...

Some actions involve individualized interventions based on a project proposed by the teacher, thus requiring pedagogical development centers to show great flexibility. In this case, innovation is in the hands of teachers, generally funded by educational initiative programs on the basis of **calls for projects**. Initiatives of this kind have become common in a number of Canadian and Belgian universities, in some cases for over 10 years (Germain Rutherford & Diallo, 2006; Frenay & Paul, 2006).

In France, project support is also considered to be a viable alternative to the 'training course' or 'professional training' route, where the impact on practice appears to be limited. When the evolution of practices is organized around a clearly defined starting-point, the approach allows for the development of viable pedagogical innovations, for their sustainability and for their dissemination among colleagues by '**contamination**' (Venturini & Chênerie, 2008).

Based on voluntary participation, these initiatives are not equally accessible to all teachers and create imbalances in terms of both disciplines and types of projects. Since 1997, the experiments conducted by the IPM (*Institut de Pédagogie Universitaire et des Multimédias*) at the University of Leuven (KU Leuven) have shown that over a third of projects are submitted by the faculty of medicine and that nearly three quarters focus directly on the use of technologies. The promoters of projects tend to be relatively experienced teachers. The impact on the development of networks of teachers and on institutional policies largely depends on the environment in which support and accompaniment take place (Frenay & Paul, 2006).

... to research action (SoTL)

SoTL support, aimed at promoting the participation of teachers in action research, is in the process of becoming a new form of pedagogical support and advice, as shown by the many studies inspired by the SoTL.

Initiatives in this direction have been taken in Quebec (Grandtner & Bélanger, 2008). In Europe, the SoTL has had the greatest impact in the UK. Its influence is also evident in Northern Europe and in French-speaking European countries, with the exclusion of France (for now).

More generally, the popularity of the SoTL varies in different subjects. An examination of recent developments at an international level shows that the natural sciences and professional studies have invested the most in the SoTL, while its impact remains marginal in the social and human sciences (Witman & Richlin, 2007).

However, many strategies can be used to integrate the SoTL perspective. According to Hubball *et al.* (2010), mentoring as part of a community of practice is an effective strategy for professional development, both individual and collective. The role of mentors in terms of development, promotion and networking has been found to be at least as important as other more formal initiatives.

Toward the recognition of teaching?

There have been very few initiatives in favor of a statutory recognition of teaching. Universities in a number of countries now employ language teachers in recognition of the specificity of language pedagogy (Tudor, 2006). Some British universities also employ university teachers, a status specifically designed for academics wishing to devote themselves primarily to teaching (MacKenzie, 2010).

Most initiatives aimed at recognizing teaching are driven by an emphasis on promotion and are often more or less

explicitly inspired by the SoTL. Such is the case in the United Kingdom, where the SoTL has served as a basis for developing the Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) defined by the Higher Education Academy (HEA) in 2006. Here, the SoTL is at the heart of the current policy of professional recognition.

Promotion measures based on the SoTL vary widely from one institution to another, but remain limited, as shown by the case of Australia, where standards in this area have yet to be fully developed and recognized and have yet to rival those prevailing in career promotion based on research activities (Vardi & Quin, 2011).

In addition to rewards in the form of teaching awards, universities in Quebec have taken specific measures to formally include teaching in the promotion process (Langevin *et al.*, 2007). In Switzerland, a number of recent experiments have focused on a collective and reciprocal conception of the assessment of teaching inspired by the peer-review methods that have been used in American, British and Australian university teaching for over ten years (Broyon & Andenmatten, 2008).

A number of Belgian and Swiss universities have promoted the use of teaching dossiers as a way of documenting the effectiveness of teaching practices and promoting efforts to improve the quality of teaching. The first assessments have shown that the approach remains insufficiently documented, particularly in terms of the internal validity of the concepts of professional development and commitment to high-quality teaching (Poumay & Georges, 2008; Wouters *et al.*, 2010).

PEDAGOGICAL DEVELOPMENT CENTERS: TOWARD MATURITY?

STRUCTURES, RESPONSIBILITIES AND EFFECTIVENESS

Pedagogical development centers have developed throughout the world over the last thirty years. In Canada, the first centers were created in the 1960s in response to student dissatisfaction. In Europe, Scandinavian countries and the United Kingdom have developed a wide range of educational development services.

Their role often includes coordinating training activities, disseminating teaching resources, dealing with the assessment of teaching quality and providing advice and support to academics. Some centers are also involved in the development of ICTs, whole others have developed support or recognition funds based on calls for projects.

These are generally centralized structures directly linked to senior management. Because they combine many interests, their activities are a potential source of tension. Changes to national and institutional policies and the (internal and external) influence of a wide range of bodies (departments, research networks, professional associations, pressure groups, etc.) can also serve to reduce their effectiveness (Frenay *et al.*, 2010; Saroyan & Frenay, 2010).

A comparative study conducted by the OECD showed that in order to be effective, a pedagogical development center must be able to be strategic (particularly in its relationships with faculty deans and other senior staff), to adopt a multidimensional approach, and **to know how to manage both internal and external pressures, whether of a technological, organizational, cultural or political nature** (Kanuka, 2010).

The success of pedagogical development is thus not only dependent on internal measures within centers, but also requires a more global approach to change, with the deployment of an effective learning organization (Langevin *et al.*, 2008; Frenay *et al.*, 2010; Saroyan & Frenay, 2010).

THE CASES OF FRANCE, BRITAIN AND AUSTRALIA

If we exclude the pioneering experiment of the CRAME (*Centre de Recherches Appliquées en Méthodes* Éducatives) set up in Bordeaux in 1981, SUP (*Services Universitaires de Pédagogie*) are a recent development in France. Created in the early 2000s, the SUP were not based on a national framework and were largely influenced by experiments in French-speaking Belgium and Canada – in particular those conducted at the universities of Sherbrooke and Louvain-La-Neuve. Today, their influence remains limited. SUP are found in just 20% of universities (mainly in scientific and technological subjects) and remain largely dependent on local efforts and the budget priorities of institutions. The duties of SUP in the areas of training, advice and counseling and the assessment of teaching can vary widely from one institution to another. The majority of SUP are involved in ICT-focused activities. Because it has developed research activities and offers a two-year qualifying course, the CRAME is a notable exception (Adangnikou & Paul, 2008). To date, no empirical study has been carried out on current activities in the field. However, the recent creation of the SUP network (réseau des SUP) represents a useful starting-point.

In the United Kingdom, EDUs (Educational Development Units) are generally involved in both professional development and university teaching. The promotion of the links between teaching and research through the SoTL is a well-established priority, although there is a relatively clear divide between service-based centers and those involved in research activities. Though vulnerable because of frequent restructuring, EDUs are mostly involved in institutional policy-making and operate on a distributed model in close cooperation with departments, but also with external professional organizations. Traditional universities have been most resistant to the introduction of 'educational development units' (Gosling, 2008).

In Australia, teaching and learning centres have developed services aimed primarily at new teachers (Palmer *et al.*, 2010). Four key factors of maturity have been suggested: strategic leadership, shared understanding of tasks, ability to perform these tasks, and ability to demonstrate the value of the service (Challis *et al.*, 2009). In a context in which funding remains uncertain, the question of leadership is central for defining a clear position on the full range of activities related to teaching and learning and the implementation of appropriate strategies to effect institutional change (Holt *et al.*, 2011).

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF INDUCTION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES

Demonstrating the value of one's activities is a complex process. According to Bachy *et al.* (2010), the impact of a formal pedagogical development measure is difficult to assess beyond the level of satisfaction of the recipients **if the assessment process is not supported by research**.

In addition, the causal relationship between the improvement of teacher preparation and student learning outcomes is difficult to establish, particularly since the existing measures involve a wide range of theoretical frameworks and teaching practices, making comparisons more difficult (Luzeckyj & Badger, 2008).

From a purely methodological point of view, the assessment of professional development programs needs to combine two types of approaches: a critical examination of large-scale studies and the development of a local assessment process. It is only with an approach adapted to local conditions that we will be able to understand the complexity of the links between professional development and student learning, to take into account the various factors that may support or impede change and to provide useful results

for the institution. The question is not to know whether the system works so much as to identify what works for whom and why (Bamber, 2008).

According to Knight *et al.* (2006), induction and professional development programmes should not only seek to change teachers, but should also have an impact on the system as a whole, its rules, resources, the division of labor, etc.

In this sense, the impact of a pedagogical development center needs to be assessed more globally, through its involvement in university pedagogy, its role within the institution and its contribution to supporting change. Several models can be used as part of this process of legitimation (Langevin *et al.*, 2007; Bélisle *et al.*, 2008; Stefani, 2010).

THE PROFESSIONALIZATION OF ACADEMIC ADVISORS

The rencontres BSQF (Belgium, Switzerland, Quebec, France) launched in 2001 and the recent creation of the SUP network (2010) in France are indicative of the increasing mobilization of pedagogical development centers in favor of quality.

These initiatives follow on from developments in the English-speaking world – for example, SEDA in the United Kingdom and HERDSA in Australia and New Zealand, and at an international level, the POD Network (Professional and Organizational Development), founded in 1979 in the United States (Grocia, 2010), and the International Consortium for Educational Development (ICED), created in 1993.

While these networks have contributed to the professionalization of academic staff, the very term 'educational advisor' does not have unanimous support and the professional identity of educational advisors remains unclear. The absence of any qualifying requirements in Europe is clearly an aggravating factor. A recent initiative by researchers and professionals from five countries to develop a new training program (FACDEV) is sufficiently original to be worth mentioning (Saroyan & Frenay, 2010).

Some recent studies have also improved our understanding of the contradictions facing academic advisors. With their activities based generally around teacher training, pedagogical support and advice and the assessment of teaching, academic advisors are caught in a tension between an 'academic' approach and a 'professional' approach. Two figures have emerged: the figure of the **professional advisor** providing services adapted to the needs of teachers and the figure of the **scholar-advisor** focusing on R&D in university teaching (Rege Colet, 2006).

FOR A SYSTEMIC APPROACH TO CHANGE

The dynamics of organizational change (regardless of the type of organization) are highly complex. In higher education, they involve individual actors (Kezar *et al.*, 2011; MacFarlane, 2011), but are also profoundly shaped by disciplinary cultures (Gibbs *et al.*, 2009) and, more generally, by the context in which change needs to occur (Fanghanel & Trowler, 2007).

MODELS OF CHANGE: TOP-DOWN OR BOTTOM-UP?

The case of Britain shows that practice regulation through audits, performance

'Arguably, the greatest challenge for EPD professionals is to bring their expertise to the university task of forming powerful learning environments for potential and serving heads of department and team leaders'
Knight *et al.* (2006).

FACDEV provides a conceptual framework for understanding, evaluating and practicing pedagogical support and accompaniment. The project involves institutions in five different countries: Belgium (University of Leuven), Canada (University of Sherbrooke, McGill University, Dalhousie University), Denmark (Aalborg University), France (University of Burgundy), and Switzerland (University of Geneva).

measures and reward systems has had a limited impact on teaching. By making teaching a largely technical activity isolated from the production of knowledge by research, some measures have contributed to a sense of professional dispossession among teachers. The point is to promote a self-reflective and contextually relevant approach in which teaching and research are not in competition (Fanghanel & Trowler, 2007).

« (...) there is still a mismatch between the behavioural characteristics required to become a professor, demanding a focus on individual performativity, and the characteristics which make good professorial leaders. This necessitates a broader set of skills in nurturing and facilitating the development of others, and a more selfless and team-based ethic. »
(MacFarlane, 2011).

This is also the view taken by Paquay *et al.* (2010), who showed that, regardless of its purpose, assessment has yet to serve as a lever for developing skills. Despite the emergence of promising strategies based on identity, cooperation and/or **reflexive practice**, the tension between the institutional and professional spheres remains unresolved.

For a significant change in practice to occur, a number of principles need to be considered. In an environment characterized by a high level of interdependence between actors, practices change and develop through interactions between staff. In addition, the purpose of change is to solve an explicit problem that the institution wishes to address (Dahan & Mangematin, 2007).

According to Gibbs *et al.* (2009), **experiencing a problem to solve** is essential from the perspective of planned change. Gibbs *et al.* draw a contrast between the entrepreneurial culture of some departments (associated with planned change) and a collegial culture characterized by a more permissive style of management and a greater freedom for actors to determine their objectives independently of any external control. In both cases, the balance to strike between daily teaching experiences and their reflection in a developing curriculum is often problematic. Ultimately, the main perceived obstacle to change is the apparent conflict between teaching and research.

LEADERSHIP AND THE ROLE OF ACTORS

In higher education institutions, leadership is dependent upon the commitment and engagement of actors – potentially all actors when they take part in actions that generate leadership (Kezar *et al.*, 2011), i.e. essentially university professors who develop forms of informal or distributed leadership through their various activities (MacFarlane, 2011).

For some, it is important to intervene 'upstream' among doctoral students and researchers. Recent research in Britain and Australia has been conducted to determine the generic skills of doctoral students. In Europe, there is an emerging trend toward increasing awareness of the professional model of knowledge construction, as opposed to the traditional Humboldtian model (Enders, 2005). In France, some studies have highlighted the potential role of doctoral schools in promoting change and innovation (Dahan & Mangematin, 2007).

Departments also have a key role to play, including in traditional universities, where research clearly predominates. Unlike the size of departments, the discipline has a significant impact. For example, in the social and human sciences, change is emergent rather than planned, but tends to be more planned in the hard sciences. Unsurprisingly, the entrepreneurial culture is more present in vocational subjects (Gibbs *et al.*, 2009).

The way in which research is organized has a direct influence on the greater or lesser tendency to change teaching practices. In other words, when research involves a discourse of expertise constructed by individuals, how colleagues teach is of little importance. By contrast, when research requires significant resources and effective organization, people are accustomed to planning their activities and to paying attention to the activities of others (Gibbs *et al.*, 2009).

The University of Fribourg has shown that the tensions between a professional model and an organizational model can be resolved by promoting a better articulation of the two approaches. 'Participatory organizational development' is an effective approach for promoting change in institutions (Charlier, 2011). Dill (2003) proposed an approach based on the principles of learning organizations, thus promoting internal knowledge transfer.

The example of FACDEV is a reminder that cooperation between institutions at a local or international level is another lever for change. A collectively developed conceptual framework is a useful basis for formalizing and evaluating practices of support aimed at promoting the pedagogical development of higher education teachers (Saroyan & Frenay, 2010).

Has the time come for France to address an issue that has so far been a taboo subject? The decline in student numbers, the reform of the status of academics and the LRU law on university autonomy are promising avenues for further development. In addition to these external factors, there is increasing interest among senior leadership teams in questions surrounding the quality of teaching and the efforts of SUP to make their activities more visible, which remain in their infancy. The recent commitment of the CPU (*Conférence des Présidents d'Université*) and of the *Caisse des Dépôts* in favor of online universities (2009) and learning centres (2011) are important milestones in the gradual shift of French higher education toward an emphasis on the quality of teaching. There remains the question of teachers…

REFERENCES

- Adangnikou Noël & Paul Jean-Jacques (2008). ‘ La formation à la pédagogie universitaire en France, une offre encore trop restreinte ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Altbach Philippe G., Reisberg Liz & Rumbley Laura E. (2009). *Trends in Global Higher Education: Tracking an Academic Revolution : A Report Prepared for the UNESCO 2009 World Conference on Higher Education*. Paris : UNESCO.
- Annoot Emmanuelle & Fave-Bonnet Marie-Françoise (2004). *Pratiques pédagogiques dans l’enseignement supérieur : Enseigner, apprendre, évaluer*. Paris : L’Harmattan.
- Åkerlind Gerlese (2007). ‘ Constraints on academics’ potential for developing as a teacher ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 32, n° 1, p. 21-37.
- Bachy Sylviane, Lebrun Marcel & Smidts Denis (2010). ‘ Un modèle-outil pour fonder l’évaluation en pédagogie active : Impact d’une formation sur le développement professionnel des enseignants ’. *Revue internationale de pédagogie de l’enseignement supérieur*, vol. 26, n° 1.
- Balme Sébastien, Barras Hervé & Schaub Mallory (2010). ‘ Impact de l’enseignement sur l’évaluation des compétences des enseignants débutants, cas du PPE à l’Université de Montpellier ’. In *AIPU 2010 - 26e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Rabat*, *17-21 mai 2010*.
- Bamber Veronica (2008). ‘ Evaluating lecturer development programmes : Received wisdom or self-knowledge? ’. *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 13, n° 2, p. 107-116.
- Bélisle Marilou, Bélanger Claire & Bernatchez Paul-Armand (2008). ‘ L’évaluation des services d’un centre de pédagogie universitaire : une démarche incontournable de légitimation du centre et de valorisation de la pédagogie ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Becquet Valérie & Musselin Christine (2004). *Variations autour du travail des universitaires*. Paris : Etats Généraux de de la Recherche et de l’Enseignement Supérieur.
- Beney Michel & Pentecouteau Hugues (2008). ‘ La formation complémentaire à la pédagogie chez les enseignants de l’Université ’. *Revue des sciences de l’éducation*, vol. 34, n° 1, p. 69-86.
- Bernatchez Paul-Armand, Cartier Sylvie, Bélisle Marilou & Bélanger Claire (2010). ‘ Le mentorat en début de carrière : Retombées sur la charge professorale et conditions de mise en œuvre d’un programme en milieu universitaire ’. *Revue internationale de pédagogie de l’enseignement supérieur*, vol. 26, n° 1.
- Berthiaume Denis & Chevalier Pierre-André (2008). ‘ Des stratégies pour aider les enseignant-e-s universitaires à développer un savoir pédagogique disciplinaire (SPD) ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Boshier Roger (2009). ‘ Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning such a hard sell? ’. *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 28, n° 1, p. 1-15.
- Bourgin Joëlle (2011). ‘ Les pratiques d’enseignement dans l’université de masse : Les premiers cycles universitaires se scolarisent-ils ? ’. *Sociologie du travail*, vol. 53, n° 1, p. 93-108.
- Boyer Ernest L. (1997). *Scholarship Reconsidered : Priorities of the Professoriate*. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass. 2e éd. (1re éd. 1990).
- Boyer Régine & Coridian Charles (2002). ‘ Transmission des savoirs disciplinaires : Une comparaison histoire/sociologie ’. *Sociétés contemporaines*, n° 48, p. 41-61.
- Broyon Marie-Anne & Andenmatten Barbara (2008). ‘ L’ ‘ Hospitation ’ ou ‘ Peer review of teaching ’ à la Haute Ecole Pédagogique du Valais (Suisse) ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Caisse des dépôts (2009). *Guide méthodologique de l’université numérique*. Paris : Conférence des présidents d’université (CPU).
- Caisse des dépôts (2011). *Mettre en place un Learning Centre : Enjeux et problématiques*. Paris : Conférence des présidents d’université (CPU).
- Challis Di, Holt Dale & Palmer Stuart (2009). ‘ Teaching and Learning Centres : Towards Maturation ’. *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 28, n° 4, p. 371-383.
- Charlier Bernadette (2011). ‘ Tensions between professional and organizational development: Towards meaningful evaluative practices for all ’. In Trowler Paul R., Saunders Murray & Bamber Veronica (dir.). *Reconceptualising Evaluation In Higher Education: The Practice Turn*. Maidenhead : Open University Press.

- Coulon Alain & Paivandi Saeed (2008). *État des savoirs sur les relations entre les étudiants, les enseignants et les IATOSS dans les établissements d'enseignement supérieur*. Paris : Observatoire de la Vie Etudiante (OVE).
- Cox Milton D. & Richlin Laurie (2004). ' Special Issue : Building Faculty Learning Communities '. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2004, n° 97, p. 1-157.
- Dahan Aubépine & Mangematin Vincent (2007). ' Institutional Change and Professional Practices : The Case of the French Doctoral Education '. In *RESUP 2007. Les Universités et leurs marchés*, *Paris*, *1-2 février 2007*.
- Demougeot-Lebel Joëlle & Perret Cathy (2010). ' Les chargés de TD/TP ont-ils tous les mêmes inquiétudes avant leurs premières interventions face aux étudiants ? '. *Education et formation interculturelles : regards critiques*, n° 9, p. 99-113.
- Demougeot-Lebel Joëlle & Perret Cathy (2010). ' Identifier les conceptions de l'enseignement et de l'apprentissage pour accompagner le développement professionnel des enseignants débutants à l'université '. *Savoirs*, vol. 2, n° 23.
- Demougeot-Lebel Joëlle & Perret Cathy (2011). ' Qu'attendent les enseignants universitaires français en termes de formation et d'accompagnement pédagogiques ? '. *Revue internationale de pédagogie de l'enseignement supérieur*, vol. 27, n° 1.
- Dill David D. (2003). ' Le paradoxe de la qualité académique : implications pour les universités et les politiques publiques '. *Revue des sciences de l'éducation*, vol. 29, n° 2, p. 337-352.
- Enders Jürgen (2001). *Academic Staff in Europe : Changing Contexts and Condition*. Westport : Greenwood Press.
- Enders Jürgen (2005). ' Border crossings: Research training, knowledge dissemination and the transformation of academic work '. *Higher Education*, vol. 49, n° 1-2, p. 119-133.
- ENQA (2005). Références et lignes directrices pour le management de la qualité dans l'espace européen de l'enseignement supérieur. Helsinki : European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA).
- Espéret Eric (dir.) (2001). *Nouvelle définition des tâches des enseignants et des enseignants chercheurs dans l'enseignement supérieur français*. Paris : Ministère de l'Éducation nationale.
- Fanghanel Joëlle & Trowler Paul R. (2007). ' New Academic Identities for a New Profession? Situating the Teaching Dimension of the Academic Role in a Competitive Enhancement Context '. In *RESUP 2007. Les Universités et leurs marchés*, *Paris*, *1-3 février 2007*.
- Fanghanel Joëlle (2007). *Investigating university lecturers' pedagogical constructs in the working context*. York : Higher Education Academy.
- Faure Sylvia, Soulié Charles & Millet Mathias (2005). ' Travail des enseignants-chercheurs : Vers un bouleversement de la "table des valeurs académiques" '.
- Frenay Mariane & Paul Cécile (2006). ' Le développement de projets pédagogiques : reflet ou source de l'engagement de l'enseignant universitaire dans ses activités d'enseignement '. In Rege Colet Nicole & Romainville Marc (dir.). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l'université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Frenay Mariane, Saroyan Alenoush & Taylor Lynn K. (2010). ' Accompagner le développement pédagogique des enseignants universitaires à l'aide d'un cadre conceptuel original '. *Revue française de pédagogie*, n° 172, p. 63-76.
- Germain Rutherford Aline & Diallo Bakary (2006). ' Défis de la formation à l'utilisation des TIC dans les universités : modèle de formation à l'intégration des TIC '. In Rege Colet Nicole & Romainville Marc (dir.). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l'université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Gibbs Graham & Coffey Martin (2004). ' The Impact Of Training Of University Teachers on their Teaching Skills, their Approach to Teaching and the Approach to Learning of their Students '. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, vol. 5, n° 1, p. 87-100.
- Gibbs Graham, Knapper Christopher & Piccinin Sergio (2009). *Departmental Leadership of Teaching in Research-Intensive Environments - Final Report*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Gosling David (2008). *Educational Development in the United Kingdom : Report for the Heads of Educational Development Group*. Heads of Educational Development Group (HEDG).
- Grandtner Anne-Marie & Bélanger Claire (2008). ' Nouvelle fonction du Conseil pédagogique : l'accompagnement au Scholarship of Learning and Teaching (SOTL) '. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l'Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.

- Grocia James (2010). ‘ Why Faculty Development? Why Now? ’. In *Building Teaching Capacities in Higher Education: A Comprehensive International Model*. Stylus publishing.
- Hénard Fabrice (2010). *Learning Our Lesson: Review of Quality Teaching in Higher Education*. Paris : OCDE.
- Hicks Margaret, Smigiel Heather, Wilson Gail & Luzeckyj Ann (2010). *Preparing Academics to Teach in Higher Education - final report*. Australian Learning & Teaching Council (ALTC).
- Holt Dale, Palmer Stuart & Challis Di (2011). ‘ Changing perspectives : Teaching and learning centres’ strategic contributions to academic development in Australian higher education. ’. *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 16, n° 1, p. 5-17.
- Hubball Harry & Burt Helen (2006). ‘ The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning : Theory–Practice Integration in a Faculty Certificate Program ’. *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 30, n° 5, p. 327-344.
- Hubball Harry, Clarke Anthony & Poole Gary (2010). ‘ Ten-year reflections on mentoring SoTL - research in a research-intensive university ’. *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 15, n° 2, p. 117-129.
- Kanuka Heather (2010). ‘ Characteristics of effective and sustainable teaching development programmes for quality teaching in higher education. ’. *Higher Education Management & Policy*, vol. 22, n° 2, p. 69-81.
- de Ketele Jean-Marie (2010). ‘ La pédagogie universitaire : Un courant en plein développement ’. *Revue française de pédagogie*, n° 172, p. 5-13.
- Kezar Adrianna, Bertram Gallant Tricia & Lester Jaime (2011). ‘ Everyday people making a difference on college campuses : The tempered grassroots leadership tactics of faculty and staff ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 36, n° 2, p. 129-151.
- Knight Peter T., Tait Jo & Yorke Mantz (2006). ‘ The professional learning of teachers in higher education ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 31, n° 3, p. 319-339.
- Kreber Carolin (2002). ‘ Teaching Excellence, Teaching Expertise, and the Scholarship of Teaching ’. *Innovative Higher Education*, vol. 27, n° 1, p. 5-23.
- Kreber Carolin (2007). ‘ What‘s it really all about? The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as an Authentic Practice ’. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 1, n° 1, p. 1-4.
- Kreber Carolin (2009). *The University and its Disciplines : Teaching and Learning within and beyond disciplinary boundaries*. Londres : Routledge.
- Langevin Louise, Bilodeau Hélène, Boisclair Michel & Bracco Marie-Anne (2007). *Formation et soutien à l’enseignement universitaire : Des constats et des exemples pour inspirer l’action*. Sainte-Foy : Presses de l’université du Québec.
- Langevin Louise, Grandtner Anne-Marie & Ménard Louise (2008). ‘ La formation à l’enseignement des professeurs d’université : Un aperçu ’. *Revue des sciences de l’éducation*, vol. 34, n° 3, p. 643-664.
- Langevin Louise (dir.) (2008). *Conceptions, besoins et pratiques pédagogiques de professeurs d’université : Perspectives pour la formation*. Montréal : Université du Québec.
- Lebrun Marcel, Deschryver Nathalie & Charlier Bernadette *et al.* (2008). ‘ Learn-Nett, un réseau pour la formation des enseignants. Une communauté de pratique ? ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*
- Light Greg, Calkins Susanna & Cox Roy (2009). *Learning and teaching in higher education : The reflective professional*. Londres : Sage.
- Lindberg-Sand Åsa & Sonesson Anders (2008). ‘ Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training in Sweden : Development of a national standards framework based on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning ’. *Tertiary Education and Management*, vol. 14, n° 2, p. 123-139.
- Lindblom-Ylänne Sari, Trigwell Keith, Nevgi Anne & Ashwin Paul (2006). ‘ How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 31, n° 3, p. 285-298.
- Losego Philippe (2004). ‘ Le travail invisible à l’université : Le cas des antennes universitaires ’. *Sociologie du travail*, n° 46.
- Luzeckyj Ann & Badger Lorraine (2008). *Literature review for Preparing Academics to Teach in Higher Education (PATHE)*. Australian Learning & Teaching Council (ALTC).
- Macfarlane Bruce (2011). ‘ Professors as intellectual leaders : Formation, identity and role ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 36, n° 1, p. 57-73.

- MacKenzie Jane, Bell Sheena & Bohan Jason *et al.* (2010). ‘ From anxiety to empowerment : A Learning Community of University Teachers ’. *Teaching in Higher Education*, vol. 15, n° 3, p. 273-284.
- Ministère de l’éducation nationale (2011). ‘ Les personnels enseignants de l’enseignement supérieur 2009-2010 ’. *Note d’information*, n° 11.06.
- Moguérou Philippe (2003). *Le monitorat d’initiation à l’enseignement supérieur : Un dispositif ambivalent, entre efficacité interne et efficacité externe*. Dijon : Institut de recherche sur l’éducation (IREDU).
- Musselin Christine (2008). *Les universitaires*. Paris : La Découverte.
- Norton Lin, Aiyegbayo Olaojo & Harrington Katherine *et al.* (2010). ‘ New lecturers’ beliefs about learning, teaching and assessment in higher education : The role of the PGCLTHE - programme ’. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, vol. 47, n° 4, p. 345-356.
- Paivandi Saeed (2010). ‘ L’expérience pédagogique des moniteurs comme analyseur de l’université ’. *Revue française de pédagogie*, n° 172, p. 29-42.
- Palmer Stuart, Holt Dale & Challis Di (2010). ‘ Australian teaching and learning centres through the eyes of their Directors : Characteristics, capacities and constraints. ’. *Journal of Higher Education Policy & Management*, vol. 32, n° 2, p. 159-172.
- Paquay Léopold, Van Nieuwenhoven Catherine & Wouters Pascale (dir.) *L’évaluation, levier du développement professionnel ? Tensions, dispositifs, perspectives*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Paradeise Catherine & Lichtenberger Yves (2009). ‘ Universités : Réapprendre la responsabilité collégiale ’. *Revue du MAUSS*, vol. 33, n° 1, p. 288-305.
- Parmentier Philippe (2006). ‘ Cinq leviers institutionnels pour la qualité de l’enseignement universitaire ’. In Rege Colet Nicole & Romainville Marc (dir.). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l’université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Peretti Claudine (dir.) (2009). *Rapport sur les Centres d’initiation à l’enseignement supérieur*. Paris : Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur et de la recherche.
- Postareff Liisa, Lindblom-Ylänne Sari & Nevgi Anne (2007). ‘ The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education ’. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 23, n° 5, p. 557-571.
- Postareff Liisa & Lindblom-Ylänne Sari (2008). ‘ Variation in teachers’ descriptions of teaching : Broadening the understanding of teaching in higher education ’. *Learning and Instruction*, vol. 18, n° 2, p. 109-120.
- Postareff Liisa, Lindblom-Ylänne Sari & Nevgi Anne (2008). ‘ A follow-up study of the effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education ’. *Higher Education*, vol. 56, n° 1, p. 29-43.
- Postareff Liisa & Lindblom-Ylänne Sari (2011). ‘ Emotions and confidence within teaching in higher education ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 36, n° 5.
- Poumay Marianne & Georges François (2008). ‘ Référentiel, Gestion Individualisée des Compétences et Portfolio Professionnel : trois outils au service de la progression et de la réussite des enseignants en développement ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Prosser Michael, Rickinson Mark & Bence Valérie *et al.* (2006). *Formative evaluation of accredited programmes*. York : Higher Education Academy.
- Prosser Michael (2008). ‘ The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning : What is it? A Personal View ’. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 2, n° 2.
- Ramsden Paul (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education*. London : Routledge. (1re éd. 1992).
- Rege Colet Nicole (2006). ‘ Représentations et modèles pédagogiques des conseillers pédagogiques en milieu universitaire ’. In Rege Colet Nicole & Romainville Marc (dir.). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l’université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Rege Colet Nicole & Berthiaume Denis (2009). ‘ Savoir ou être ? savoirs et identités professionnels chez les enseignants universitaires ’. In Hofstetter Rita & Schneuwly Bernard (dir.). *Savoirs en (trans)formation : au coeur des professions de l’enseignement et de la formation*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Rey Olivier (2005). ‘ L’enseignement supérieur sous le regard des chercheurs ’. *Dossier de synthèse de la VST*, février. Lyon : Institut national de recherche pédagogique (INRP).
- Romainville Marc & Donnay Jean (dir.) (1996). Enseigner à l’université, un métier qui s’apprend ? Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Romainville Marc & Rege Colet Nicole (dir.) (2006). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l’université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.

- Romainville Marc (2009). ‘ Entre l’écorce et l’arbre : Principes et modalités de la formation pédagogique des enseignants universitaires ’. In Bedin Véronique (dir.). *L’évaluation à l’université : évaluer ou conseiller ?* Rennes : Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- Sadler Ian (2008). *Development of new teachers in higher education : Interactions with students and other influences upon approach to teaching*. [PhD thesis]. University of Edinburgh.
- Saroyan Alenoush, Amundsen Cheryl & McAlpine Lynn *et al.* (2006). ‘ Un modèle de développement pédagogique pour l’enseignement universitaire ’. In Rege Colet Nicole & Romainville Marc (dir.). *La pratique enseignante en mutation à l’université*. Bruxelles : De Boeck.
- Saroyan Alenoush & Frenay Mariane (dir.) (2010). *Building Teaching Capacities in Higher Education : A Comprehensive International Model*. Stylus publishing.
- Schwartz Rémy (dir.) (2008). *Commission de réflexion sur l’avenir des personnels de l’Enseignement supérieur : Rapport à Madame la ministre de l’Enseignement supérieur et de la Recherche*. Paris : Ministère de l’enseignement supérieur et de la recherche.
- Smith Jan (2010). ‘ Forging identities : The experiences of probationary lecturers in the UK ’. *Studies in Higher Education*, vol. 35, n° 5, p. 577-591.
- Smith Jan (2011). ‘ Beyond evaluative studies : Perceptions of teaching qualifications from probationary lecturers in the UK ’. *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 16, n° 1, p. 71-81.
- Stefani Lorraine (2010). *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Academic Development: Principles and Practice*. New-York : Routledge.
- Stes Ann, Gijbels David & Van Petegem Peter (2007). ‘ Student-focused approaches to teaching in relation to context and teacher characteristics ’. *Higher Education*, vol. 55, n° 3, p. 255-267.
- Stes Ann, Min-Leliveld Mariska, Gijbels David & Van Petegem Peter (2010). ‘ The impact of instructional development in higher education : The state-of-the-art of the research ’. *Educational Research Review*, vol. 5, n° 1, p. 25-49.
- Stes Ann, Coertjens Liesje & Van Petegem Peter (2010). ‘ Instructional development for teachers in higher education : Impact on teaching approach ’. *Higher Education*, vol. 60, n° 2, p. 187-204.
- Taylor Lynn K. & Rege Colet Nicole (2009). ‘ Making the shift from faculty development to educational development : A conceptual framework grounded in practice ’. In Saroyan Alenoush & Frenay Mariane (dir.). *Building Teaching Capacities in Higher Education: A Comprehensive International Model*. Stylus publishing.
- Trigwell Keith & Prosser Michael (2004). ‘ Development and Use of the Approaches to Teaching Inventory ’. *Educational Psychology Review*, vol. 16, n° 4, p. 409-424.
- Trigwell Keith (2009). ‘ Relations between teachers’ emotions in teaching and their approaches to teaching in higher education: A pilot study ’. In *EARLI 2009*, *Amsterdam*, *25-29 août 2009*.
- Trowler Paul R. & Knight Peter T. (2000). ‘ Coming to Know in Higher Education : Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts ’. *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 19, n° 1, p. 27-42.
- Trowler Paul R. & Bamber Veronica (2005). ‘ Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training : Joined-up policies, institutional architectures and enhancement cultures ’. *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol. 10, n° 2, p. 79-93.
- Tudor Ian (2006). ‘ Teacher training and ‘quality’ in higher education language teaching : Strategies and options ’. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, vol. 29, n° 4, p. 519-532.
- Vardi Iris & Quin Robyn (2011). ‘ Promotion and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning ’. *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol. 30, n° 1, p. 39-49.
- Venturini Patrice & Chênerie Isabelle (2008). ‘ Le projet accompagné, une stratégie de formation continue intéressante pour les enseignants universitaires en France ’. In *AIPU 2008 - 25e Congrès de l’Association internationale de pédagogie universitaire*, *Montpellier*, *19-22 mai 2008*.
- Witman Paul & Richlin Laurie (2007). ‘ The Status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the Disciplines ’. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, vol. 1, n° 1.
- Wouters Pascale, Lanarès Jacques, Frenay Mariane & Berthiaume Denis (2010). ‘ Des dossiers d’enseignement pour soutenir le développement professionnel des enseignants à l’université : Apports, questions méthodologiques et enjeux institutionnels ’. In *Congrès International d’Actualité de la Recherche en Education et en Formation (AREF 2010)*, *Genève*, *13-16 septembre 2010*.

To cite us :

Laure Endrizzi (2011). «Learning how to teach in higher education: a matter of excellence ». *Current Literature Review in Education,* n°64, september.

On line : http://ife.ens-lyon.fr/vst/DA/detailsDossier.php?parent=accueil&dossier=64&lang=en

Our last reviews :

- Rémi Thibert (2011). « School inspections: from control and regulation to support and counselling ? » *Current Literature Review in Education*, n° 67, november.

On line : http://ife.ens-lyon.fr/vst/DA/detailsDossier.php?parent=accueil&dossier=67&lang=en

- Annie Feyfant (2011). « The effects of pedagogical practices on learning » *Current Literature Review in Education*, n° 65, September.

On line : http://ife.ens-lyon.fr/vst/DA/detailsDossier.php?parent=accueil&dossier=65&lang=en

- Olivier Rey (2011). « PISA: knowledge and uses ». *Current Literature Review in Education*, n° 66, October.

On line : http://ife.ens-lyon.fr/vst/DA/detailsDossier.php?parent=accueil&dossier=66&lang=en

Subscribe to our newsletter :

https://listes.ens-lyon.fr/sympa/info/veille.analyses

© École normale supérieure de Lyon
Institut français de l'Éducation
Agence Qualité Éducation – Veille et Analyses
15 parvis René-Descartes BP 7000 – 69342 Lyon cedex 07
veille.scientifique@ens-lyon.fr
Standard : +33 (04) 26 73 11 24
Télécopie : +33 (04) 26 73 11 45