

# Towards a Toolbox for Scholarship of Academic Development (SoAD)

Amaury Daele  
University of Lausanne, Switzerland

Paola Ricciardi Joos  
University of Teacher Education Vaud, Switzerland

## Abstract

*Assessing and evaluating educational development actions in Higher Education is at the heart of many issues related to both institutions and educational developers' own professional development. Scholarship of Academic Development (SoAD) may be a mean to deal with these issues (Badley, 2001; Ricciardi Joos, Tormey & Daele, 2016). This paper aims at proposing and illustrating a general framework to identify different educational developers' reflective mindsets regarding their practice.*

## Introduction

The centres for teaching and learning in higher education have in recent years had to deal with issues relating to the evaluation of the quality and the impact of their services. These issues are posed not only from an institutional perspective but also from the perspective of educational developers and their professional development (Little, 2014; Patel, 2014). Proposing innovative high-quality services and meeting the specific needs of teachers and institutions implies a continuous development of the competences of developer teams (Cruz, 2016). We, like other authors, believe that the Scholarship of Academic Development (SoAD) may constitute an interesting means to overcome these challenges (Badley, 2001; Little, 2014; Ricciardi Joos *et al.*, 2016). However, the literature in this field is relatively varied and recent. It is not always easy to locate this literature, be it to find definitions of what SoAD is all about or to identify theoretical frameworks or the associated methods. Moreover, the personal objectives and perspectives of educational developers who embark on SoAD are not unique and encompass a great diversity.

Therefore, this paper aims at proposing a general framework that highlights the relations between the development stages of educational developers' practice towards SoAD, different mindsets developers may adopt regarding the development of their practice and possible actions of developers to support this development. This framework is based on the literature in the SoTL field (Bélanger, 2010), a.o. the teachers' mindsets (reflexive practitioner, reflective practitioner, practitioner-researcher) proposed by Donnay and Charlier (2006) after Schön (1983). Based on this general framework, our paper also aims at proposing not only conceptual tools, such as Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick's evaluation levels (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006), the RUFDATA approach (Saunders, 2000) and Brookfield's four lenses model (Brookfield, 1995), but also practical tools (activities, scenarios) to support educational developers in pursuing a SoAD approach. This set of complementary tools may help further and appreciate a reflection, evaluation or research about educational developers' actions and impacts (Condon *et al.*, 2016; Daele *et al.*, 2015). We illustrate the use of the tools with examples highlighting the need for their adaptation to varied contexts. Ultimately

our communication suggests a framework and a set of tools to inform reflection on educational developers' practices by promoting creativity rather than prescribing "best practices".

### **Theoretical background and framework**

Like other authors, we consider the expressions "Academic Development" and "Educational Development" to be synonymous (Badley, 2001; Little, 2014; Patel, 2014). "*Both terms (educational and AD) within the context of this paper refer to higher education professionals who are employed in teaching and learning centres or units with the responsibility and role of supporting academic staff in the design and delivery of teaching and learning practice.*" (Patel, 2014, p. 244). In this context, educational developers promote the professional development of teachers through training, counselling, supervision of innovative projects, SoTL, etc. Several authors therefore consider that educational developers ought to "set the example" by developing strategies for their own professional development (Badley, 2001; Wilcox, 2009). We believe that entering into this process is useful and important for developers for at least three reasons: (a) acquire and develop competences, (b) reinforce their credibility among teachers and other partners with whom they work, and (c) evaluate and report on their actions and their effectiveness with regard to their institution (Badley, 2001; Little, 2014; Patel 2014; Ricciardi Joos *et al.*, 2016).

However, developing one's professionalism as an educational developer in higher education is not always easy (Daele, Crosse, Delalande & Pichon, 2016; Patel, 2014). First of all, the developers come from very varied disciplines and academic fields (Green & Little, 2015) and are not necessarily linked to or aware of higher education teaching or the analysis of their practices (Little, 2014). Furthermore, the developers often work on a part-time or very part-time basis (Daele *et al.*, 2016; Green & Little, 2015), particularly in French-speaking higher education institutions (i.e. Belgium, France, Quebec, Switzerland). Many are also teachers or have other responsibilities at the same time. Finally, the institutions that recruit educational developers do not always have a clear understanding of what they expect in terms of skills development and do not necessarily provide them with opportunities to evaluate their actions or analyse their practices. Patel (2014) submits in this regard that "[Educational developers] *have little opportunity to engage in scholarship*" (p. 242). To this should be added the widespread feeling that the research produced by educational developers is not always valued at the right level (Little, 2014): "*In short, we need to continue to seek ways to make our scholarly projects more useful and our useful projects more scholarly*" (p. 6).

The purpose of our contribution is not to propose an umpteenth definition of SoAD or a new model based on exhaustive review of the existing works on the subject, but rather to bring together a number of relevant elements within a consistent framework, and then to propose a number of practical tools to support a SoAD at the individual or team level. This means that we will not dwell on the history of the concept of SoTL. After Hutchings and Shulman, we will suffice by saying that "*A scholarship of teaching is not synonymous with excellent teaching. It requires a kind of "going meta," in which faculty frame and systematically investigate questions related to student learning - the conditions under which it occurs, what it looks like, how to deepen it, and so forth - and do so with an eye not only to improving their own classroom but to advancing practice beyond it*" (Hutchings & Shulman, 1999, p. 13). This means that a teacher involved in a SoTL project is a teacher who systematically questions himself on the learning of his students in order, on the one hand, to improve his practice and, on the other hand, to contribute to the advancement of knowledge on teaching

and learning by communicating his questioning and his analyses (Rege Colet, MacAlpine, Fanghanel & Weston, 2011).

We (Ricciardi Joos *et al.*, 2016) believe that this definition can easily be transposed to educational development. An educational developer therefore needs to question himself with regard to the professional development of teachers, to explore the conditions for this development, and in particular the impact of his own actions, and to communicate on this subject. More specifically, "*engaging in SoAD implies taking into account [...] four dimensions: basing one's work on academic literature, evaluating one's own work through rigorous reflection, sharing the products of this reflection in an international context, and focusing on the impact of one's work, and not only the manner in which it is perceived.*" (Ricciardi Joos *et al.*, 2016, p. 287).

Thus, as in the literature on SoTL which distinguishes three different "phases" or "positions" of teachers with respect to the development of their expertise (McKinney, 2007) (*Good Teaching, Scholarly Teaching and SoTL*), we propose to also distinguish three phases or positions of educational developers with respect to their expertise: *Good Educational Development, Scholarly Educational Development and SoAD/SoED* (see table 1 below). Furthermore, we describe and characterise these three phases by comparing them with the reflexive mindsets of Donnay and Charlier (2006) on the one hand, and with the three practice analysis methods proposed by Ashwin and Trigwell (2004) on the other hand.

Building on the works of Schön, Donnay and Charlier (2006) describe six mindsets for the creation of knowledge by a professional in connection with reflection on his action. Between the mindset of "practitioner" who is focused on his action and that of "researcher" who is focused on the creation of generalisable theoretical knowledge, other mindsets can be adopted, notably those of a

- Reflexive practitioner who is capable of describing for others the professional situations he has experienced and the conditions of these situations. This is a first step away from the existing practice.
- Reflective practitioner whose objective is to describe professional situations for the purpose of analysing, explaining and communicating them to others. This involves a greater conceptualisation of the practice which therefore becomes more shareable.
- Practitioner-researcher who seeks to decontextualise practices by analysing them and making them transferable to other situations. The language used is theorised and shared by a large scientific community.

In Table 1 below, we compare these three mindsets with the three phases that we identified in SoAD.

Ashwin and Trigwell (2004), for their part, identify three different objectives in the analysis of one's own practices: to develop *personal knowledge, local knowledge* or *public knowledge*. According to these authors, the purpose of these three types of analysis is to develop different types of knowledge, for which they need different data and evidence. In the same way as described above, we will compare these three types of objectives and the three phases of SoAD.

Collecting all these elements allows us to characterise the three phases of SoAD in the table below.

Table 1: Proposition of a general framework for the SoAD process

Phases in the professional development of an educational developer towards the SoAD/SoED (after McKinney, 2007)	Mindsets (Donnay & Charlier, 2006)  Objectives of knowledge development (Ashwin & Trigwell, 2004)	Examples of possible actions
<p>Good Educational Development</p> <p><i>In this phase, the educational developer aims to describe his practice, and to comprehend it for himself in its action context.</i></p>	<p>Reflexive Practitioner</p> <p>Purpose: To inform Personal Knowledge at the individual level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To undergo training</li> <li>- To perform an analysis</li> <li>- To prepare a reflexive logbook/individual portfolio</li> <li>- To conduct an individual reflection (possibly supported by the team) on training and development provided to teachers or on the conducted teaching evaluations</li> </ul>
<p>Scholarly Academic/Educational Development</p> <p><i>In this phase, the educational developer seeks to analyse and comprehend his/her practice so as to compare it with others and communicate it to colleagues.</i></p>	<p>Reflective Practitioner</p> <p>Purpose: To inform Local Knowledge at the team or institutional level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To prepare a team portfolio</li> <li>- To participate in formal exchanges of reflections among educational developers (developer networks, community of practice, etc.)</li> <li>- Observation between peers</li> </ul>
<p>SoED/SoAD</p> <p><i>In this phase, educational developers observe and analyse their practices in a systematic manner for the purpose of communicating them more widely in standardised scientific language.</i></p>	<p>Practitioner-Researcher</p> <p>Purpose: To inform Public Knowledge at the scientific community or educational developers' community level</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To conduct research on the values and conceptions of French-speaking educational developers and present their results at an international conference</li> <li>- To conduct a self-evaluation of the services provided, compare it with the opinion of partners, and publish their reflections in a journal</li> <li>- To conduct a survey among programme managers on the use of the results of student evaluation of teaching (SET) and publish the results in the proceedings of a scientific conference</li> </ul>

In our view, SoAD therefore consists in adopting a practitioner-researcher mindset, the objective being to systematically analyse one's actions and practices and to share these analyses in order to contribute to the advancement of knowledge in the field of educational development. We do not consider the SoAD phase in our framework as a standard that needs to be met, but rather as a position that can be attained when one aims to analyse one's practices and the scope of one's actions.

Like Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin and Prosser (2000) for SoTL, we see four dimensions in SoAD (Ricciardi Joos *et al.*, 2016, p. 286):

1. An informative dimension: educational developers conduct analyses and research into their actions, based on the literature in this area and thus contribute to further developing that literature;
2. A reflective dimension: developers conduct a systematic and critical reflection on their practices;
3. A communicative dimension: developers share their investigations with their colleagues, whether as part of a team or at scientific conferences, whether orally or in writing;
4. A conceptual dimension: developers focus their attention not only on what they do but also on the impact of their actions on teachers' practices and, ultimately, on student learning.

The conceptual and practical tools presented elsewhere in this text set out to cover these four dimensions.

With the theoretical framework in place, we will now focus on the putting into practice of SoAD by answering the following two questions:

1. How - and what reference models to use - to concretely plan the analysis and/or evaluation of the actions of an educational developer?
2. What activities can be deployed to trigger and promote this analysis and/or evaluation process?

To answer these questions, we will first present three conceptual tools which we consider to be particularly interesting review grids to support a SoAD process. Secondly, we will briefly list a few examples of practical tools (activities, scenarios) capable of promoting the process.

## **Conceptual tools**

The three conceptual tools presented below have been designed to serve various audiences. Each of them involves a series of dimensions or questions to support and structure an evaluation or a reflexive process. This section aims to demonstrate their potential usefulness for educational developers who wish to reflect on, conduct research into and exchange their practice.

### **Evaluation model of Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick**

Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2006) propose a four-level model to evaluate a training or development programme. These evaluation levels refer to four keywords - Reaction, Learning, Behavior, Results - and are linked together so that increasingly detailed information about the training under evaluation is obtained.

More specifically, these four levels are defined as follows:

1. (Evaluating) Reaction : “[...] *evaluation on this level measures how those who participate in the program react to it. I call it a measure of Customer satisfaction*” (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2006, p. 21),

2. (Evaluating) Learning : “[...] can be defined as the extent to which participants change attitudes, improve knowledge, and/or increase skills as a result of attending the program” (p. 22),
3. (Evaluating) Behavior : “[...] can be defined as the extent to which change in behavior has occurred because the participant attended the training program” (p. 22),
4. (Evaluating) Results : “[...] can be defined as the final results that occurred because the participants attended the program. (...) results like this are the reason for having some training programs. Therefore, the final objectives of the training program need to be stated in these terms” (p. 25).

While this model is proposed to evaluate the usefulness of a training, the preface of the third edition of the work by Kirkpatrick et Kirkpatrick suggests that they can be applied to other fields, for example to the field of marketing (evaluation of an advertising campaign), the field of politics (evaluation of the introduction of a new law), or the field of technology (evaluation of the use of new IT software). By analogy, we think it is appropriate to consider that the model can be applied not only to the evaluation of any *training* provided by an educational developer, but also to the evaluation of the other activities undertaken by the developer, i.e. counselling of teachers, evaluation of teaching or research. Applied to the actions of a developer, these four levels can be interpreted as follows:

1. *Satisfaction* of the partners with the training, evaluation or counselling service provided by the educational developer. These partners are persons who rely on developers to respond to educational issues. They are teachers, teaching assistants, but also programme, department and institution managers.
2. *Changes in attitude, knowledge and/or skills developed* by the partners following the training, evaluation or counselling by the educational developer. This level can be evaluated by an expert or by the partner himself who will then primarily express a "sense" of learning.
3. *Change in behaviour* of the partners (or *the implementation* of learning or counselling) following the training, evaluation or counselling provided by the educational developer.
4. *Final results* following the participation of the partners in the training, evaluation or counselling by the educational developer - these results are the rationale behind the services provided by the educational developer. The effects on satisfaction or the students' sense of learning are examples of these results.

The following examples illustrate an evaluation process that could refer to each of these four levels.

1. At the level of satisfaction: At the request of the rector's office of a university, the developers of a centre for teaching and learning developed the directive and the procedure for a periodic evaluation of the training programmes. The educational developers subsequently organised a debriefing meeting with the actors concerned, which allowed them to observe that the faculties had actively been involved and that the rector's office was satisfied because the work carried out met the accreditation requirements, but also that the process involved a significant extra work load for the faculty collaborators.
2. At the level of attitude change: To meet the requirements of a nomination committee, a professor with little teaching experience invited an educational developer to provide personalised counselling for the purpose of preparing a portfolio. This portfolio was an important issue because it was one of the elements on which the final nomination

was to be based. Several months after this follow-up, the professor met with the developer and told him to what extent the portfolio had caused her to alter her mindset in regard to the students: she was aware that she was not responsible for everything, but now saw herself as being part of a system, and was far more open to criticism from students.

3. At the level of behavioural change: As part of the evaluation of the courses at a University, a professor's course was evaluated by the students with the aid of an online questionnaire. The educational developer forwarded the results of the evaluation to the professor concerned: they showed that the students were not satisfied with the clarity of the examination instructions. Following these results, the professor produced a reference document explaining the learning assessment methods for his course, which he presented orally to all students at the beginning of the year and was subsequently made available online by placing it on the internet platform used for managing his course.
4. At the level of the final results: At the request of a number of professors interested in this issue, the educational developers of a university organised a workshop on large audience teaching. The objective was to identify opportunities to dynamise large group teaching and to provide moments of interaction between (professors and) students. Six months later, the educational developers contacted by phone the professors who had participated in the workshop to gauge the relevance of the workshop content for application in the field. The participants who had been given the opportunity to implement the suggested activities, pointed out that the evaluation of their courses by their students included encouraging comments.

### **The RUFDATA approach**

The model presented below considers the collection and analysis of data as an evaluation process. In the same perspective, the RUFDATA approach (Daele *et al.*, 2015 ; Saunders, 2000) proposes to identify the general outlines of any evaluation process - and even more generally any project - by answering seven questions. This approach seems to be appropriate for structuring the reflection of a developer who wishes to reflect on his practice (Daele *et al.*, 2015). The RUFDATA approach is based on the following seven questions:

- What are our *Reasons* and *Purposes* for evaluation?  
The purpose here is to define the objective of the steps taken to analyse and evaluate educational developer practices. This may be, for example, to develop one's personal knowledge, to improve one's practices, to report on his actions to the hierarchy, or to describe, report on and promote these actions. Multiple objectives can be pursued simultaneously.
- What will be the *Uses* of our evaluation?  
This question concerns the use of the evaluation results. This could be, for example, the formulation of good practice recommendations for other developers or the gathering of these results for the management of a university teaching centre.
- What will be the *Foci* for our evaluation?  
The object is to identify the specific elements on which the evaluation will focus. This could be a task for the developer but also, on a smaller scale, a specific action or a project carried out with teachers. Another object is to determine the success or performance indicators to be used for each of the evaluated elements.
- What will be our *Data* and *Evidence* for our evaluation?  
In considering the purposes of the evaluation, it is appropriate to identify the data collection methods that allow relevant information to be collected. These may be questionnaires, interviews, observations, etc.

- What will be the *Audience* for our evaluation?  
Once the evaluation has been completed, the audience for which the results are intended needs to be determined: teachers, the hierarchy of the establishment, other educational developers, researchers in university teaching, etc. The answer to this question will determine the communication format to be used.
- What will be the *Timing* for our evaluation?  
Evaluating (the effect of) one's own actions is not the primary concern of educational developers. The evaluation must therefore be planned as part of one's activities and provision must be made for a number of key stages and for tasks to be accomplished between each of these stages.
- Who should be the *Agency* conducting the evaluation?  
Depending on the case, it will not always be the developer who conducts the evaluation of his actions. It may be interesting to call on third parties, for example to survey the users of a centre for teaching and learning. The use of external experts or other developers may provide interesting insights.

Based on the answers to these questions, an educational developer can specify the objectives and the orientation of an evaluation that will focus on his actions (process) or on the effects of his actions (results). He can also specify the way in which his approach can be shared and applied.

### **Brookfield's four lenses model**

In 1995, Brookfield presented a highly influential portfolio model as a reflection tool for teachers. For him, the objective of reflective practice is to become critical, which he defines as the ability to identify (often implicit) premises that one may hold about students, teaching and learning. For this, we need to "*find some lenses that reflect back to us a stark and differently highlighted picture of who we are and what we do*" (1995, p. 28-29). This can be done by looking at one's own practice from four different perspectives: 1. An autobiographical point of view, 2. The perceptions of students, 3. The experiences of colleagues, 4. The literature. While the Brookfield model thus constitutes a guide for the professional development as a teacher, the concepts and tools on which his model is based are largely transposable and applicable to the profession of educational developer.

In fact, by way of illustration, an educational developer may take an autobiographical look at his activities over a given period by conducting, for example, the following steps: document what he has done to evaluate his different activities, note down the questions that have emerged and also what he has learned, what has worked well and what could be improved, formulate possible changes and improvements, identify possible additional resources needed to properly carry out his work. For this, he has access to various tools such as fact sheets to guide him in a structured questioning process (dealing with a specific situation he has experienced, or the consistency of his actions, etc.) or the viewing of footage of a development or training activity.

The developer can also consult the partners with whom he has collaborated to know their representation of the activities he has undertaken. This consultation may involve different audiences: it may be aimed at seeking the opinion of academic staff who received programme evaluations, the opinion of assistants who participated in a training course, the opinion of a teacher for whom the developer conducted a personalised follow-up, etc. For this, the developer can base himself, for example, on an evaluation questionnaire, a semi-directive interview, a one-minute paper, or a focus group.

The developer can also invite his colleagues to give him their viewpoints on the activities undertaken within the institution. The comments of peers, who work in the same institution or in another context, will without any doubt enhance the developer's individual reflection. Again, several tools may be considered. Peers can observe how an educational developer conducts a development session with a teacher, or review the schedule of a training programme intended for a group of students, or act as mentor for defining a promotion strategy for his support role within the institution. To ensure the successful outcome of this exercise, the educational developer and his pairs can also use forms to structure their exchanges.

Finally, the developer can obviously draw multiple benefits from consulting the existing literature in the field of higher education teaching. This allows him, among other things, to better explain the objectives he has set himself, the adopted strategies, the results obtained and the beliefs and context that underpin his practice. It will probably enhance his exchanges with colleagues. Moreover, his analyses will permit him to compare his experience with what he has read, which is even more valuable if there is no colleague to exchange it with. The developer can also gain access to this content by participating in conferences on university teaching. To document these contributions, the developer can use tools that facilitate the appropriation of the content discussed, for example by answering a few key questions (central concepts of an article, practicable use of the addressed theoretical elements, etc.).

The Brookfield model appears to be clearly transposable to educational developers anxious to develop a reflection on their practice: it encourages them not to base any assessment solely on their own representation or that of their partners, but to collect information and identify opportunities for improvement beyond their usual context while at the same time aiming to appropriate them.

### **Examples of SoAD and practical tools**

The conceptual tools presented below are interesting in that they orient and structure the educational developer's reflection around several dimensions or questions. By comparison, the practical tools refer to all activities capable of contributing to the actual content of this reflection.

Some of these practical tools were already discussed in the presentation of the conceptual tools. In the presentation of the RUFDATA approach, for example, the suggestion is made to use questionnaires, interviews or observations to obtain data and evidence of the conducted evaluation. Another example is the presentation of the Brookfield model, where numerous tools are suggested to obtain and record the information obtained from four sources to be considered: viewing footage, organising a focus group with colleagues, submitting a training schedule to a peer, reading scientific articles, etc.

Our objective is not to compile an exhaustive list of all possible tools, but above all to dwell on the three examples of SoAD mentioned in the above table, for the purpose of presenting:

- their specific practical tools,
- any links they may have to the conceptual tools discussed earlier,
- and to what extent they cover the four dimensions (informative, reflective, communicative, conceptual) identified by Trigwell *et al.* (2000).

### **Exploring the attitudes promoted by French-speaking educational developers**

As part of a collaborative research project carried out by a network of educational developers from universities in Western France, four developers set out to produce a "family portrait" of educational developers in French-speaking higher education (Daele *et al.*, 2016), taking inspiration from the questions previously raised by Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy and Beach (2006) and Green and Little (2016). They had four objectives:

- To report on the background and the experience of French-speaking developers;
- To report on the diversity of institutional structures;
- To identify the priorities, actions, challenges and current issues according to the developers;
- To identify the opportunities for training development.

The aim of this research revolved around various levels. In view of the growing importance of educational development in French-speaking higher education in recent years, the developers who conducted this survey wanted to know who the developers were, how they train themselves on the job, and how they see their job. This touches not only upon their professional development but also upon the individual and collective professional identity that they develop. This questionnaire should subsequently lead to the design of training for educational developers that is both adequate and meets specific needs.

The developers compiled an online questionnaire. Several of the questions related to the respondents' personal views about their job as an educational developer. One of these questions was as follows: "From the following attitudes of educational developers, choose five which you believe to be the most valuable and rank them in order of importance (1 = most important, 5 = least important)". A total of 29 attitudes were proposed: "benevolence", "active listening", "critical friendship", "empathy", "support for reflection", "confidentiality", etc. The five most frequently cited attitudes were: 1. Co-construction, 2. Active listening, 3. Adaptation, flexibility, 4. Support for reflection, 5. Critical friendship. The five least cited attitudes were: 1. Reformulation, 2. Independence, 3. Modesty, 4. Loyalty to the institution, respect of rules and procedures, 5. Public service.

The answers to this question could be used directly in a training course for novice educational developers. One activity was to present to the latter the five most frequently cited attitudes in the study and to ask them to describe concrete actions or situations in which these attitudes were put into practice by a developer. This enabled the educational developers to gain a better idea of what "active listening" or "being flexible" really means in practice.

With reference to the four dimensions of SoAD as defined above, we find that each of them was implemented in this study:

- the informative dimension through consultation of the literature to identify both the issues and the structure of the questionnaire;
- the reflective dimension by the fact that questionnaire invites its authors (and the respondents) to undertake a reflection on their profession;
- the communicative dimension as the works were presented at a conference and subsequently used to implement a training course for developers;
- the conceptual dimension by the fact that the study invited its authors (and the respondents) to question the nature of their conceptions and approaches to their profession and the scope of their actions.

### **Conducting a (self-)evaluation of the services provided by educational developers**

The BSQF (for Belgium, Switzerland, Quebec, France) is a biennial meeting of educational developers in higher education. In 2011, this meeting was organised in Switzerland with over 80 participants on the theme of the scope of actions of educational developers.

To ensure that the exchanges at this meeting focused on concrete issues, the member educational developers of the organising committee decided to provide the participants with a working file made up of situations they had experienced themselves in their practice. To this end, they each performed an evaluation of one or more of their interventions at their respective institution.

For each situation, the educational developers organising the meeting chose to proceed with a dual evaluation. Firstly, they performed a self-evaluation of the action taken. Secondly, they personally consulted the partners who had directly benefited from their services. For this dual evaluation, the educational developers and the partners evaluated the work of the educational developer by answering four questions each relating to one of the four levels of the Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick model.

The use of this model facilitated this process and resulted in the compilation of a file of 23 cases on which the participants in the BSQF conference could exchange views. This file allowed peers to discuss situations and results with which they were familiar. Furthermore, the collective reflection to which this meeting gave rise was made public in the form of an article in a scientific journal (Daele *et al.*, 2015).

In the process, each of the four dimensions of SoAD was addressed:

- the informative dimension through, amongst others, the use and adaptation of the Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick model;
- the reflective dimension through the self-assessment of certain specific actions;
- the communicative dimension through the desire to submit real life situations to the criticism of peers;
- the conceptual dimension through interrogating partners about the impact of their actions.

### **Evaluating the impact of SET at a University**

A new mechanism for the evaluation of initial training modules at the University of Teacher Education Vaud (HEP Vaud) in Switzerland, was implemented in 2011-2012. It consists of an evaluation by the students through an online questionnaire and a self-evaluation report prepared by the module managers. The exploitation of the results from this mechanism should ideally contribute to a double loop for continuous improvement of the training: regulation of the modules and regulation of the programmes.

Two years after the implementation of this mechanism, two approaches were considered to monitor the actual use of these results: 1. consult the self-assessment reports in which the module teams commented on the student evaluations and recommended possible measures to improve their teaching; 2. conduct semi-directive interviews among the various members of the directorate, teaching department managers and teaching and research unit managers. These activities, followed by their analysis, were intended to measure the usefulness and the relevance of the module evaluation results for steering purposes.

At the end of this survey, the educational developers in charge of the evaluation considered a number of points, including the limited use of the module evaluation results by the various actors concerned.

This institutional reflection on the impact of the new evaluation mechanism in the regulation of base training at HEP Vaud was furthermore shared during a presentation at an international conference on assessment in education (ADMEE) and by a publication in the proceedings of the said conference (Ricciardi Joos, & Rovero, 2014).

In this example, we can identify the four dimensions of SoAD:

- the informative dimension due to the fact that this reflection was motivated by texts that questioned the impact of student evaluation of teaching in higher education;
- the reflective dimension due to the criticism from the partners;
- the communicative dimension due to the fact that the results were presented at a scientific conference;
- the conceptual dimension due to the fact of questioning the use of the evaluation results.

## **Discussion and practical implications**

After a reminder of the definition of SoAD and the major elements of this process, this communication was intended to further enhance this definition by taking inspiration from the concepts developed within the framework of SoTL: the different 'positions' of teachers towards the development of their expertise (McKinney, 2007), the mindsets of teachers (Donnay & Charlier, 2006) and the knowledge development objectives (Ashwin & Trigwell, 2004), and the four dimensions of SoTL as identified by Trigwell *et al.* (2000).

It subsequently focused on the means capable of supporting SoAD. Several conceptual tools, originally designed for different purposes, were presented and their possible application illustrated: Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick's four-level model, RUFDATA approach and Brookfield's four lenses model. Moreover, various practical tools were suggested both during the presentation of the conceptual tools and in the examples given of SoAD.

The literature on SoAD already covers several approaches in a variety of contexts. By way of example, we could cite the impact analysis of the work of educational developers, as conducted by Rust (1998) who evaluated the impact of an educational development workshop organised by the *Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development*, in the UK, on teaching practice. In concrete terms, Rust addresses this issue in two ways: a review of the literature on the subject and a survey among teachers who had participated in a defined number of workshops organised by this centre. We could also cite self-study as defined and encouraged by Wilcox (2009). This approach encourages reflection on one's practice through various methods and exercises, such as knowing the points of view of several third parties on a real life situation. Finally, we could cite the construction of an Educational Developer Portfolio as proposed in the guide published by the Educational Developers Caucus (EDC), a network of educational developers in higher education in Canada (McDonald *et al.*, 2016). Each of these processes seems perfectly relevant to educational developers who aim to explore, improve, and perhaps transform their practice.

The content of this communication was presented as a toolbox that can be added to the numerous other means already covered by the existing literature. It primarily encourages creativity as a function of contexts in which educational developers operate, rather than

prescribing good practices. Moreover, as a reflection on SoAD, it hopes to modestly contribute to a dual objective: to support the professional development of educational developers and to reinforce their credibility among their multiple partners within their respective institutions.

## References

- Ashwin, P., & Trigwell, K. (2004). Investigating staff and educational development. In P. Kahn & D. Baume (Éd.), *Enhancing staff & educational development* (p. 117-131). London; New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Badley, G. (2001). Towards a pragmatic scholarship of academic development. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 9(3), 162-170.
- Bélanger, C. (2010). Une perspective SoTL au développement professionnel des enseignants au supérieur : Qu'est-ce que cela signifie pour le conseil pédagogique ? *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(2).
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Condon, W., Iverson, E. R., Manduca, C. A., Rutz, C., & Willett, G. (2016). *Faculty development and student learning. Assessing the connections*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Cruz, L. (2016). The Scholarship of Educational Development: A Taxonomy. *To Improve the Academy*, 35(2), 222-228.
- Daele, A., Crosse, M., Delalande, P., & Pichon, A. (2016). *Un portrait de famille des conseillers pédagogiques dans l'enseignement supérieur francophone*. In Les valeurs dans l'enseignement supérieur. 29ème congrès de l'AIPU, Lausanne.
- Daele, A., Ricciardi Joos, P., Schaub, M., Barras, H., Lambert, M., Rochat, J.-M., Stainier, N. (2015). Evaluer la portée des actions des conseillers pédagogiques dans l'enseignement supérieur: mise à l'épreuve et adaptation d'outils méthodologiques. *Revue suisse des sciences de l'éducation*. 37 (2), 361-382.
- Donnay, J. & Charlier, E. (2006). *Apprendre par l'analyse des pratiques. Initiation au compagnonnage réflexif*. Namur: PUN-Editions du CRP.
- Green, D. A., & Little, D. (2016). Family portrait: a profile of educational developers around the world. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 21(2), 135-150.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programs: the four levels* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Little, D. (2014) Reflections on the State of the Scholarship of Educational Development. *To Improve the Academy*, 33(1), 1-13.
- McDonald, J., Kenny, N., Kustra, E., Dawson, D., Iqbal, I., Borin, P., & Chan, J. (2016). *Educational Development Guide Series: No.1. The Educational Developer's Portfolio*. Ottawa, Canada: Educational Developers Caucus.
- McKinney, K. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Patel, F. (2014). *Promoting a culture of scholarship among educational developers: exploring institutional opportunities*, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 19(3), 242-254.
- Rege Colet, N., McAlpine, L., Fanghanel, J., & Weston, C. (2011). Le concept de Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Recherche et formation*, 67, 91-104.
- Ricciardi Joos, P., Rovero, Ph. R. (2014). L'évaluation des modules des formations de base à la Haute école pédagogique Vaud (Suisse) : que fait-on des résultats ? In *Actes du 26e colloque de l'Admée-Europe « Cultures et politiques de l'évaluation en éducation et en formation »*, Marrakech.
- Ricciardi Joos, P., Tormey, R., & Daele, A. (2016). Développer son expertise académique de conseiller pédagogique, In A. Daele & E. Sylvestre (Eds.), *Comment développer le conseil pédagogique dans l'enseignement supérieur ?* (pp. 281-299). Brussels: De Boeck.
- Rust, C. (1998). The impact of educational development workshops on teachers's practice. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 3(1), 72-80.
- Saunders, M. (2000). Beginning an Evaluation with RUFDATA: Theorizing a Practical Approach to Evaluation Planning. *Evaluation*, 6(1), 7-21.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Sorcinielli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of faculty development*. Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of Teaching: A model. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 155-168.
- Wilcox, S (2009). Transformative educational development scholarship: beginning with ourselves, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(2), 123-132.