

Faculty Development for Educational Leadership

*Hetty Grunefeld, Frans Prins, Jan van Tartwijk,
Rob van der Vaart, Daphne Loads, Jon Turner,
Katarina Mårtensson, Anne Marthe Nilsen Gibbons,
Thomas Harboe, Karen Poder, and Theo Wubbels*

In collaboration with Daphne Loads, Jon Turner, Katarina Mårtensson, Anne Marthe Nilsen Gibbons, Thomas Harboe, Karen Poder, Theo Wubbels

H. Grunefeld (✉)

Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Centre for Teaching and Learning,
Utrecht University, PO Box 80127, 3508 TC, Utrecht, The Netherlands

F. Prins • T. Wubbels

Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Utrecht University, PO Box 80127,
3508 TC, Utrecht, The Netherlands

J. van Tartwijk

Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Department of Education, Utrecht
University, PO Box 80127, 3508 TC, Utrecht, The Netherlands

R. van der Vaart

Utrecht University, Paulus Potterstraat 8, 3583 TC, Utrecht, The Netherlands

© The Author(s) 2017

B. Stensaker et al. (eds.), *Strengthening Teaching and Learning in
Research Universities*, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-56499-9_4

I INTRODUCTION

At most research-intensive universities, academic careers are largely driven and determined by success in the domain of research, and most faculty members in leadership positions at these universities typically have a strong track record in research (Goodall 2006; Goodall et al. 2014; Spendlove 2007). However, more and more these universities recognize that academic leadership not only needs to be provided in research but also in education (e.g. ‘LERU Mission’ 2016). This requires specific expertise, which still needs to be developed in many research-intensive universities. For this reason, universities committed to the enhancement of teaching and learning offer professional development aimed at developing expertise in educational leadership.

This chapter describes five examples of dedicated faculty development trajectories for educational leadership in research-intensive universities, focusing on their nature and effects. We first discuss the concept of ‘educational leadership’ as an important component of academic leadership in

D. Loads • J. Turner

Institute for Academic Development, University of Edinburgh, 1 Morgan Lane,
Edinburgh EH8 8FP, Scotland

K. Mårtensson

Division for Higher Education Development, Lund University, MNO-huset,
Box 117, 221 00 Lund, Sweden

A.M. Nilsen Gibbons

Education and Research Administration Office, University of Oslo, Postboks
1072, Blindern, 0316 Oslo, Norway

T. Harboe

Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Øster Farimagsgade 5,
1353 København, Denmark

K. Poder

HR & Organisation, University of Copenhagen, Nørregade 10, 1165
København, Denmark

research-intensive environments. We will then portray and compare professional development trajectories for educational leadership in five research-intensive universities: the universities of Edinburgh, Lund, Oslo, Copenhagen, and Utrecht. The final sections summarize and discuss the main characteristics and the perceived gains and challenges of the educational leadership trajectories in these five universities.

2 WHAT IS EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP?

In this chapter, we refer to leaders in formal positions in universities with a responsibility for teaching as *academic leaders*, and to academics in both formal and informal positions with a responsibility for leading education as *educational leaders* (cf. Grunefeld et al. 2015). This implies that educational leadership is not the equivalent of educational management which refers to formal positions for resource allocation, logistics, administration, and so on (cf. Bolden et al. 2012). Being able to take the lead in education in research-intensive universities requires a thorough understanding of the typical mix of qualities (in knowledge and research, education, human capital, and potential for public service) of a research-intensive university, because educational leaders need to have the capacities to mobilize these qualities to the maximum for enhancing the quality of education (Bryman 2007; Gibbs et al. 2008; Milburn 2010; Raines and Alberg 2003; Scott et al. 2008; Vilkinas and Ladyshevsky 2012; Wolverton et al. 2005). Educational leadership also requires a thorough awareness of the context (such as development of their field in the wider context of academia, the labour market, or the social impact of science) and key insights of the educational sciences (Eraut 1994; Knight and Trowler 2001), people skills (Spendlove 2007), and personal characteristics such as self-control and resilience (Goodall 2006). Competence in educational leadership shows in the quality of the design, deliverance, and evaluation of teaching activities and curricula, and in their evaluation and analyses, but also in the capacity to motivate and involve others. Faculty development programmes and courses for educational leadership typically combine these elements of educational competence and leadership skills, in a mix that differs between universities. The expertise required for educational leadership is sometimes labelled as ‘scholarship of educational leadership’ (SoEL, see: Hubball et al. 2015; Boyer 1997).

3 PAYING ATTENTION TO EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Although many presume that excellent researchers will make excellent teachers, research evidence shows that there is no significant relationship between faculty's research productivity and the quality of their teaching (Marsh and Hattie 2002; Qamar uz Zaman 2004). This implies that also in universities with a strong reputation in research, attention needs to be paid to the quality of teaching. The quality of educational leadership is very important for the quality of teaching in research-intensive universities. Graham Gibbs and his colleagues (Gibbs et al. 2008, 2009) studied the impact of educational leadership in 11 research universities in 8 countries. Nineteen case studies were undertaken to identify the role of leadership in creating and supporting excellent teaching. Educational leadership practices and approaches varied across these cases, but in only 2 of these 19 cases, there was little evidence of leadership playing a major role in creating teaching excellence. In all 17 other cases, leadership appeared important and, in many, it was pivotal according to Gibbs and his colleagues (2009, p. 2).

Educational leadership should be provided at various levels of the organization. Educational leadership within the schools or departments of a university will ensure bottom-up innovation and quality improvement of teaching and learning practices. Moreover, educational leaders in academic departments may be indispensable as change agents when universities want to implement strategic institutional policies for raising the quality of teaching and learning (Scott et al. 2008). A recent study by Mårtensson and Roxå (2016) shows that leadership is enacted in very different ways, and that educational leadership does contribute to educational development in a faculty. Educational leadership at the university level can stimulate university-wide discussions on quality teaching and stimulate the development of a culture in which education is accepted as 'core business' of the university.

4 PROVIDING FACULTY DEVELOPMENT FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The quality of educational leadership is important for the quality of teaching. Universities that do not offer faculty development for educational leadership may assume that faculty in leadership positions will simply learn what is needed on the job, and that experience and the leadership qualities that faculty members have shown in research teams or in administration will 'automatically' transfer to educational leadership. Research on expertise

shows that expertise is task and domain specific and that there is little transfer from high-level proficiency in one domain to proficiency in other domains, even when the domains are very similar (Feltovich et al. 2006). It may not be expected, therefore, that research or leadership expertise in any academic discipline, which will probably include analytical skills, knowledge of the discipline's deep structure, writing skills, skills in prioritizing, and self-management and the like, will automatically 'transfer' into educational leadership qualities when academics land in such positions.

Experience is indeed important for the development of expertise; however, experience alone is not enough (Ericsson 2006). After an acceptable and stable level of performance has been reached in the first years of practice, for many it is enough to maintain this level and do so with minimal effort for years or even decades (Ericsson 2006, p. 691). This explains the weak correlate of experience and job performance beyond the first years of practice in both low- and high-complex jobs (McDaniel et al. 1988). To develop educational leadership expertise, according to Ericsson (2006) individuals need to deliberately and systematically improve their performance on relevant tasks through seeking suitable challenges and systematically analysing their performance. Ericsson refers to this process as *deliberate practice*. A coach or mentor has an important role in providing feedback on performance and the identification of suitable tasks (Ericsson 2006, p. 692). Other authors rather use the concept *reflection* when describing the cyclic process of performance, evaluation, analysis, and planning for improved performance (e.g. Korthagen et al. 2001; Hatton and Smith 1995; Mann et al. 2009; Schön 1983), but in all these publications, the importance of systematic and deliberate improvement of performance is emphasized as crucial for continuous professional development and expert performance.

From this literature, it can be concluded that if research universities with a strong reputation in research are not satisfied with just an 'acceptable and stable' level of performance in teaching, they need to invest in faculty development for teaching and educational leadership.

5 EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP TRAJECTORIES IN RESEARCH-INTENSIVE UNIVERSITIES

In this section, we portray five trajectories for educational leaders that are offered by research-intensive universities in Northwest Europe. In these portraits, we will focus on (1) history and aims of the trajectories,

(2) characteristics of their content and format, and (3) evidence of the effectiveness of the trajectories. The five trajectories were identified using a survey to identify interesting practices. Four universities have substantial dedicated programmes, while a fifth chooses a substantial individual approach, aimed at enhancement of educational leadership. In the following, we focus on these five universities: Utrecht University, Lund University, University of Oslo, University of Copenhagen, and the University of Edinburgh.

The portraits are based on documentation and additional site visits, where designers, facilitators, and participants of the trajectories were interviewed. The descriptions of the format of the trajectories provide information about the five core features that have been identified as contributing to the effectiveness of teacher professional development: *content focus, active learning, coherence, duration, collaborative practice* (Desimone 2009; Garet et al. 2001; Guskey 2003; Scott et al. 2008; Steinert et al. 2006; van Driel et al. 2012; van Veen et al. 2012).

5.1 *Utrecht University*

5.1.1 *History and Aims*

Utrecht University's *Onderwijskundig leiderschap* (Educational leadership) programme was developed in 1999, in the context of the university's policy to systematically invest in the quality of university education including the quality of the teaching. Among the other measures taken were the introduction of teaching qualifications for all academic teachers and a career structure in which esteem for teaching and research was more balanced. The central level of the university supported the development of the programme, but the initiative was taken by the deans of the science faculties. They anticipated major curriculum changes and wanted their senior academics to have sound knowledge of, and experience with, current higher education pedagogy and leading curriculum change processes, and to build a network with like-minded colleagues throughout the university. These became the aims of the programme. Between 2000 and 2016, the programme was offered 13 times, with about 200 participants in total. Time investment for participants throughout the 14 months of the course is about 200 hours. The two facilitators of the programme are always a professor in educational sciences and an educational consultant.

The programme aims at faculty with leadership roles in teaching: programme leaders, programme coordinators, directors of studies, and leaders of curriculum change processes. From the very beginning, the idea was that the educational leadership programme should add to the status of teaching at the university and that faculty would regard participation as an honour and as a reward for their endeavours to improve teaching and learning. The programme board (Centre of Excellence in University Teaching or CEUT), consisting of respected professors from all faculties, selects about 16 participants per course from a larger group nominated by the deans of the faculties, and monitors the quality of the course and the development and progress of participating faculty.

5.1.2 *Characteristics*

The backbone of the programme is a series of eight 24-hour meetings, with approximately six-week intervals, away from campus in a conference hotel. The thematic parts of the meetings align with the overall theme leadership for educational change. The programme is flexible and responsive to the needs and questions of participants.

An integral part of the programme is the study tour of one week to universities abroad. Witnessing education and educational innovation elsewhere helps to put developments at the own institution in perspective. It also provides new ideas and insights that can be implemented in the home institution.

Each participant is carrying out a curriculum development project in her or his own faculty, department, or school. The project should result in a substantial change. The participant has a leading role in a project team within the faculty. Examples of projects are developing and implementing a new postgraduate degree programme, improving and implementing the assessment strategy in an undergraduate degree programme, and internationalizing the curriculum.

Strong communities are formed in the peer coaching groups, where groups of maximum six participants reflect on and discuss in a systematic way critical incidents that have happened in the daily practice of group members.

At the end of the programme, participants write a reflection on their learning gains and the results of their project. All participants who complete the programme receive a certificate of participation.

5.1.3 *Effectiveness*

Over the years, Utrecht University's educational leadership programme was evaluated several times. A recent study of the design and effects of the programme (Grunefeld et al. 2015) made use of surveys among alumni of the programme and among supervisors of participants, in order to establish the effects of the programme in terms of personal development, teaching practice, network, and career, and to find the components that are seen as especially effective for the development of leadership qualities. The alumni survey was sent to 117 participants of eight cohorts, with a response of 66%. Interviews were held with 20 academic leaders (vice-deans, heads of department, directors of education), all responsible for nominating or sponsoring participants of the programme.

Participants themselves report strong effects of the programme on the development of their knowledge of education and educational change, on the range of activities they are involved in, and on the size of their network. The programme helped them to develop a broader vision on learning and teaching, and gain a better overview of what is going on at Utrecht University and in higher education institutions more broadly. They also report having a better overview of developments in education. Participants have also changed their teaching practice and became more involved in curriculum development projects and educational coordination tasks. About half of the respondents report still being in contact regularly with other participants of their cohort of the leadership programme or with other former participants, even long after the programme ended. Since a few years, a yearly dinner meeting for alumni is supported by the university to help with maintaining contacts.

The effects were recognized by the academic leaders. They see the alumni of the educational leadership programme as colleagues with useful knowledge of learning, teaching, and curriculum development, and as leaders of educational innovation. The innovative projects they did during their participation in the programme were seen as successful and were followed up with other innovative activities (Grunefeld et al. 2015). The academic leaders also mention that former participants take on more formal leadership tasks in education. The proportion of former participants of the educational leadership programme in positions as director of education of undergraduate or graduate programmes has grown to 50%. Since 2014 it has been a university strategy to recruit—where possible—new Directors of

Education from the pool of alumni of the CEUT educational leadership course.

Former participants see the opportunity to discuss with, exchange experiences with, and learn from fellow participants as the single most formative element of the course. Second is the study tour abroad and the input by experts during the thematic meetings. The academic leaders, who nominated candidates, consider the selective nature of the programme and its connectedness to daily work (through curriculum projects) as the most valuable characteristics.

5.2 *Lund University*

5.2.1 *History and Aims*

The Lund University programme for educational leaders was developed in 2008, as a logical next step for members of faculty who had been involved in the many educational development activities in the university, as participants and as leaders. The academic developers had recognized the importance of leadership for the development of teaching, and the importance of support for local leaders of teachers and teaching. The Centre for Educational Development designed the course *Ledning av pedagogisk verksamhet* (Leading Academic Teachers). The programme aims at academics with formal leadership roles in programmes and departments: programme leaders, programme coordinators, directors of studies, and heads of departments. The programme aims to support the participants in their work as leaders of educational development, to support the development of university teaching and with that of student learning, and to collect and document pedagogical leaders' experiences, in order to substantiate further development. Between 2008 and 2016, the programme was offered five times with 12 to 14 participants per group. Time investment for participants is about 200 hours. Two academic developers are the designers and facilitators of the programme.

5.2.2 *Characteristics*

An essential element of the programme is a leadership project. Participants volunteer for the programme and apply individually or in groups with a draft of a project involving educational development and improvement of student learning, and involving leadership concerns in their own professional context. The plans for this project play an important role in the selection

process. Examples of projects are: studying how quality assurance for a department's study programmes could be organized, leading development of teaching in the department, reorganizing a complete curriculum, investigating the role of programme leaders across a faculty, developing academic writing skills across a programme, and developing a teaching quality system within a big department.

The group meets one half day per month, with two full days at the start, over a period of ten months. Guests, who are experienced educational leaders at department, programme, faculty, and national level, are invited to several of the meetings. They share their experience, participate in discussions, and then leave, giving the participants time to reflect together on leadership issues that were raised in relation to their own project and daily practice. Participants work continuously on their projects, make several progress reports, and discuss these with their peers. During the meetings and in the reports, the emphasis is on reflection on the leadership projects. The facilitators provide participants with leadership literature that is relevant for their situation and their project. At the end of the year, participants write and peer-review final scholarly reports of their projects, and they present the results in the group. The reports remain available for participants in the programme, as well as for future cohorts, to learn from experiences of peers.

Characteristic for education development and teacher development at Lund, and also for this leadership programme, is the emphasis on the forming of communities of practice (Wenger 1999). The group of participants functions as a community of learners throughout the programme, in which trustful conversations and collegial support are possible.

The programme supports educational leaders in developing their leadership expertise by providing opportunities for reflection and a repertoire of examples of how problems can be solved, as well as scholarly literature on relevant leadership issues.

About two-thirds of the participants received a certificate for completing the programme with the presentation of their final report.

5.2.3 *Effectiveness*

The programme was evaluated shortly after each course ended, using an online evaluation form with open questions and with written, paper-based evaluations. These evaluations had an 80–90% completion rate.

The participants characterized the results of the programme as increased insight in (theoretical) leadership perspectives that are useful for practice. They gained self-confidence in their leadership roles and recognition as

trained leaders. Elements of the format of the programme perceived as especially important are the role of both facilitators (assessed as superb), the secure space and time for reflection they offered, the guest teachers and discussions in the group, and the opportunity to compare experiences with the situation in other universities.

It seems that the communities of practice are effective during the programme but not thereafter, except when participants are co-workers in the same department.

5.3 *University of Oslo*

5.3.1 *History and Aims*

The University of Oslo *Utdanningslederprogrammet* (Study Leaders programme) was developed in 2013 to support leaders of study programmes in their responsibility for leading teaching and learning. The University wanted to offer an education-focused variant for the very successful Research Leadership Programme. Using information from several focus group meetings with study programme leaders and other stakeholders, and using the format of the Research Leaders Programme, senior advisors of the central administration unit (human resources) of the university and external consultants (with leadership development expertise) developed the programme.

The programme aims to stimulate the participants' efforts to build excellent educational environments and to facilitate good conditions for teaching and collaboration between the administration, students, and different academic communities. Between 2013 and 2016, the programme was organized three times with a total of 70 participants. The people who designed the programme also facilitate it.

The programme is aimed at academics and administrative employees with leadership roles in programmes and departments: study leaders, degree programme leaders, degree programme coordinators, and directors of studies. Two-thirds of the participants are members of faculty; the others are administrative staff with key roles in education. The facilitators create a group from lists of candidates provided by the faculties, a group that is heterogeneous with respect to faculties and years of experience in academia. Real leadership responsibility is required.

5.3.2 *Characteristics*

Just before the start, all participants are interviewed about their expectations and the format of the programme, about their current topics of interest and current challenges. Participants are asked to write a personal development plan. Examples of challenges are reducing drop-out in an undergraduate programme, the politics of a small degree programme in a large department, or leadership/process issues concerning the restructuring, reorganization, or development of a study programme.

The group meets three times during a period of six to nine months, in off-campus meetings of respectively three, two, and two full days. For each meeting, some preparatory work is required. Time investment for participants is about 80 hours.

Characteristic for this programme is the focus on individual development as a leader and the role of leaders in the development of the university organization. To perform adequately, leaders need to understand themselves, their role, and their influence on the environment. Therefore, the three central themes during the meetings are strategic leadership and visions for study programmes, implementation and management (moving from intention to action), and leadership in educational environments (how to encourage colleagues to best performance). Experienced educational leaders and guests, who offer models and theories that can be used by participants to reflect on their own experiences as leaders, introduce these themes during the sessions.

The reflection process is supported in core groups, or reflective teams, which is a very central feature of the design of the programme. The facilitators each lead such a small reflective team. Topics are participants' leadership role, feedback participants have asked and received from colleagues, and leadership in change processes. The reflective teams provide a safe learning environment and an opportunity to learn from each other's insights and experiences.

At the end of the programme, all participants receive a certificate.

5.3.3 *Effectiveness*

All meetings are evaluated with face-to-face feedback from the participants and with an online questionnaire. About 90% of the participants of the most recent cohort find the programme useful for the development of their leadership competence. The participants report effects of their participation in the programme on their daily working environment; they mention

increased confidence and clarity as a leader, increased reflexivity, and a higher awareness of their scope as leaders. They feel that they are more visible for faculty management and colleagues, and that their qualities as leader are recognized. Participants develop expertise as reflexive leaders. Some of the core groups still meet, and participants contact each other on education topics when necessary. An inspiration day in the year between cohorts, organized by the facilitators for participants of all cohorts, stimulates contacts and further cooperation.

5.4 *University of Copenhagen*

5.4.1 *History and Aims*

The University of Copenhagen *LedelsesUdvikling for studieledere* (Leadership development for programme directors) was developed in 2014, as a specific version of the university's general approach to leadership and leadership skills development. It was part of the university strategy to invest in education and educational leadership. The programme for programme directors was developed through collaboration between the central HR department and the pedagogical units at faculty level. The programme is aimed at programme directors, heads of study, course coordinators, deputy heads of department for teaching and the like, typically leaders in middle management positions with a focus on leading teaching.

While the general leadership programme aims to develop personal leadership skills, the specific programme adds the aim to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to address challenges regarding leading teaching and curriculum design and development. A third aim is to develop a network of colleagues in the same managerial positions. Between 2014 and 2016, the programme has been organized four times with a total of 50 participants. The designers also facilitate the programme.

The programme is strongly recommended for all programme directors, as is the general programme for all other leaders. The HR department invites programme directors from all faculties to participate in the programme.

5.4.2 *Characteristics*

A preliminary interview is held with each participant to discuss the programme, their work, and their expectations and wishes for the content of the programme. An educational change project or innovation is selected

to be used as a means to link the programme to daily practice. Examples of the educational change/innovation projects are curriculum change or quality enhancement projects, or the development of pedagogical competences among staff. Typical questions that participants have revolve around ways to involve colleagues in the project or ways to align university, faculty and programme strategies.

The programme consists of two two-day retreats, two one-day meetings, five workshops of 2–4 hours, and three extra learning group meetings of 3 hours each in between the meetings. The entire programme is completed with an optional two-day trip to a foreign university. The time investment for participants is about 80 contact hours, plus the study trip.

Characteristic for this programme is the combination of leadership and curriculum topics. Personal leadership skills and receiving and reflecting on 360-degree feedback are planned in the first meetings. Other leadership topics are the structure of a university organization and leading and managing in a university setting. The education topics focus on curriculum design and curriculum development and align with relevant educational development within the university. Guests from senior management and leadership positions are invited to share their experience as leaders, and to discuss university and faculty strategies with a focus on education.

The learning groups, or reflective teams, are an important feature to bring daily practice into the programme, and to offer an opportunity to start a longer-lasting network. Facilitated by one of the course leaders, one participant presents his or her project and a dilemma or question. The other four or five participants in the group think along, discuss, and offer their own experiences and ways to deal with these questions.

The study visit is included to help forming a network, to find inspiration in comparing the home system with another system, and to find contacts abroad.

Participants receive a certificate if they ask for one.

5.4.3 *Effectiveness*

All parts of the programme are being thoroughly evaluated, showing a high degree of satisfaction among the participants. They report to have gained inspiration, but also that from time to time it can be difficult to get a complete picture of their management role. They feel that they have learned a language to discuss dilemma's that occur in leadership roles, and to discuss curriculum design and development issues.

A short survey revealed that participants have formed a network that had meetings twice a year, for some years after participating in the programme. To have administrative support in organizing these meetings has proven to be essential.

5.5 *University of Edinburgh*

5.5.1 *History and Aims*

The Edinburgh Teaching Award (EdTA) was launched in 2014 as part of the University of Edinburgh's continuing professional development (CPD) framework for faculty and staff involved in learning and teaching. The Institute for Academic Development (IAD) designed the framework on behalf of the Senate Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) in 2012. It was developed as an opportunity for academics at all levels in the university to engage with professional development at different points in their career and be directly linked to what they do to enhance teaching and learning. By focusing on the professional development of teachers, the framework should have a positive impact on student learning. The framework, including the Award, is mapped against the UK Professional Standards Framework and accredited by the Higher Education Academy, which means that achievements are transferable to other universities in the UK.

EdTA aims to provide all staff involved in teaching and supporting learning with rich opportunities to reflect on and develop their practice throughout their careers. While levels 1 and 2 are aimed at teachers near the start of their career, levels 3 and 4 are aimed at experienced academics with a leadership or management role at course, programme, or school level, and include a strong focus on leadership and impact at a strategic level in relation to teaching and learning. Taking part in the EdTA at the leadership levels 3 and 4 involves CPD activities that fit with daily work as an academic teacher at a senior level and an educational leader, with a particular focus on critical engagement in reflection about their practice. Between 2014 and 2016, about 90 participants started at levels 3 and 4, and new cohorts are enrolled twice each academic year. Candidates for the EdTA register for the programme themselves or in response to suggestions from their School. Participants have between six months and two years to complete a level of the EdTA. The time commitment varies from participant to participant depending on their prior experience. The IAD is the designer and main facilitator of the programme.

5.5.2 *Characteristics*

Characteristic of the approach at the University of Edinburgh is the combination of an overarching framework of professional development goals for different roles and career stages of university teachers, with provision based around flexible pathways and a broad range of CPD activities to achieve those goals. Participants choose those activities that help them best with their daily practice. The CPD opportunities for the leadership levels vary from workshops and courses, to secondments, networks and mentoring, to working on curriculum development projects, pedagogic research, and evaluation.

Participants work towards a submission to the Award Panel, who assess the work against the criteria of the chosen level of the Framework. The submission could be a reflective blog or a presentation, and includes also a record of CPD activities, relevant experiences and success, and two references. Relevant experiences to reflect upon at the leadership levels could be, for example, leading a learning and teaching enhancement project in the School, or involvement in a University-wide initiative to improve assessment and feedback, or taking a role in a review team for a Teaching Programme Review.

The most important criterion, however, is not just which activities people have done, but what they have learned. This reflection on practice is supported and encouraged by a mentor, who gives feedback on blogs or accounts of reflection on practice. The mentor will meet with the participant face to face or online. Interactions between mentor and mentee will, for example, include discussions about what leadership or seniority actually entails. The mentor will also point participants to external resources including educational literature. The mentor is allocated to a participant by the IAD and will have been awarded Level 3 and/or Level 4, either via the EdTA or directly from the Higher Education Academy.

To introduce and support participants, group meetings are organized. The purposes are always to provide support and encouragement and to share experiences, address queries and concerns about the practicalities of the EdTA, facilitate a reading or discussion activity, and offer protected writing time. As the Framework is aimed at CPD, participants can meet at the various CPD activities organized by the IAD and in schools. Some level 3 and 4 participants attend writing retreats and journal clubs.

5.5.3 *Effectiveness*

About 20% of the enrolled participants in levels 3 and 4 have already completed the Award within the first two years. The programme was evaluated after two years by an external researcher, using interviews with participants, Heads of School and members of staff of the IAD, and an online questionnaire for participants.

Participants give positive feedback about the EdTA. They reported to have gained useful insights and confidence, a deeper understanding of and changes to teaching practices, benefits of time discussing and sharing practice with a broader range of colleagues, and a sense of being valued and supported in the teaching role and CPD. More than half of the completers have taken up a mentor role for other EdTA participants. Mentor mediation was seen as crucial in the process of reflection on learning.

Some schools are developing school versions of the Framework, linked to curriculum development and/or teaching enhancement activities. Schools increasingly build the EdTA into reward, review, and recruitment policies. Completion of levels 3 and 4 is included in evidence of excellence in education for academic promotions.

6 COMPARING THE FIVE TRAJECTORIES

In this section, we compare and discuss the five trajectories for educational leaders. The focus will be on the history and aims, the characteristics of the design of these trajectories, and the achieved effects.

6.1 *History and Aims of the Five Trajectories*

Four universities chose to adapt an existing programme or develop a course for groups of educational leaders, whereas Edinburgh chose to create an individual CPD approach. Several motives were mentioned to develop professional development opportunities for educational leaders: to fundamentally improve the quality of education, and a need for informed senior academics prepared for leading educational change (Utrecht); the university teaching and learning strategy, especially the need to improve the status of teaching compared to research (Oslo); to support educational leaders in their specific tasks and responsibilities (Lund, Copenhagen); and to stimulate CPD, including for leadership levels, and to offer an award that is recognized as an achievement at other universities (Edinburgh).

Enhancing personal leadership skills and reflection on leadership practice are central in the aims of the Oslo, Copenhagen, Lund, and Edinburgh trajectories. The aims to develop knowledge on current topics in higher education research and change processes, and to design and successfully implement solutions for education problems, are central in the programmes at Utrecht and Copenhagen. Building a network of like-minded colleagues in the same positions is an added aim in Utrecht, Oslo, and Copenhagen.

The trajectories are not open for everyone. All are meant for academics with leadership roles in programmes and departments: programme leaders, programme coordinators, directors of studies, heads of departments, and sometimes leaders of educational change projects. The nomination and selection approach at Utrecht reflects their desire to offer something special to the academics who play a crucial role in improving the quality of teaching and learning. Lund's and Edinburgh's academics on the other hand can enter without selection.

The certificate given to participants at Utrecht University has a formal effect because, for some positions in the university, having been a participant is recommendable or even required. The most consequential assessment is done in Edinburgh, because the Award is recognized throughout the UK at member institutions of the Higher Education Academy.

6.2 *Characteristics of the Five Trajectories*

We take a closer look at the various formats of the programmes, using the structure of the five core features for effective professional development (Desimone 2009).

6.2.1 *Content Focus*

Content focus refers to whether the content of a programme is related to the ultimate result the participants have to achieve (Desimone 2009), in this case, leadership of education or educational change, with a positive effect on student learning. In the five approaches, three content areas are present with different emphasis: leadership, change processes, and higher education pedagogy and curriculum design.

Leadership refers to personal leadership and the leadership role in the university and faculty organization. The programmes in Oslo and Copenhagen use a variety of methods to support self-knowledge and development. The 360-degree feedback method is an example. Learning from and discussing with experienced leaders from different levels in the university

is another method, used in Oslo, Lund, and Copenhagen. Oslo's compact summary is that educational leaders need to understand themselves, their role, and the environment. Understanding the environment is implemented through, for example, discussions about the university's teaching strategy.

In all programmes, change processes are part of the content, for example, through invited lectures (Utrecht), reading and discussing literature about change in higher education (Lund), or through learning from experienced leaders (Oslo, Copenhagen, Lund). All five universities ask participants to reflect on their leadership of educational change projects that they are carrying out in their daily work.

The third main content area is higher education pedagogy and curriculum design. Both the programmes in Utrecht and Copenhagen spend about half of the time on topics in this area. Literature and discussions with guest teachers and among the participants are important sources for learning. Discussions about the use of these theories in the real-world educational change projects of the participants help with the transfer to daily practice.

We can conclude that the programmes, although with different emphasis, focus on the areas that are crucial for the roles of educational leaders.

6.2.2 *Active Learning*

When participants are invited to be actively involved in discussions, observations, and giving feedback, instead of just listening, we speak of active learning (Desimone 2009). The four programmes have as a key feature the reflection on leadership practices. Different methods are used: a reflective team or learning group approach in Utrecht, Oslo, and Copenhagen, and reflection during the group meetings in Lund. In the reflective team approach, the group learns under supervision of a facilitator a method to together reflect deeply on critical incidents. The reflections can lead to deliberate changes in the participant's approach to the tasks on hand, where they think that is appropriate. The course facilitators and the mentor offer suitable information, knowledge, and activities that help participants in developing their leadership role.

In the four programmes, participants are invited to take an active role in discussions with guest teachers and other participants, in reflection and reading tasks. In Lund's programme, scholarly reflection using literature on leadership and peer review is a key activity in the meetings. Utrecht participants travel to several universities abroad, as an inspirational and informative activity. Participants at Utrecht, Lund, and Edinburgh write reflective reports on their learning gains and the results of their project. In

summary, all trajectories require participants to take an active role in their learning process.

6.2.3 *Coherence*

Based on the description given by Desimone (2009), coherence is necessary between the programme and the prior knowledge and beliefs of the participants, and between the policies and strategies of the organization and what happens in the programme. By asking participants to choose an educational development project in daily practice, as is the case in Utrecht, Copenhagen, and Lund, or by selecting participants based on their educational leadership role as is the case in Oslo, a connection is made between programme and daily practice. In the Utrecht programme, the project functions also as a source for requests for certain topics or for invitations to certain guest teachers in the remaining part of the programme. This provides the participants with knowledge from areas that are education specific, rather than discipline specific. In all trajectories, the most important feature seems to be not just what the daily practice is but what participants learn from it, their reflection on practice (Schön 1983).

6.2.4 *Duration*

According to Desimone (2009), to achieve intellectual change, a programme needs to be of sufficient duration, which would be at least about 20 hours in a period of at least six months. All four programmes require participants to work on their personal development in a period of 4 to 14 months, investing around 80 hours (Oslo, Copenhagen) or 200 hours (Utrecht, Lund) of work. Most of the time of the Utrecht and Copenhagen programmes is contact time. Furthermore, the two-day meetings of the Utrecht, Copenhagen, and Oslo programmes are organized off-campus, which intensifies the opportunities for discussions and socializing. In summary, the duration of these four trajectories should be sufficient to achieve intellectual change.

6.2.5 *Collective Participation*

The last core feature in Desimone's model is collective participation of colleagues of the same organization, that could lead to continued interaction and peer learning even after the programme ends. In the programmes of Utrecht, Oslo, and Copenhagen, building a network throughout the university is an explicit aim. In contrast to the four programmes, Edinburgh's approach is not aimed at bringing colleagues together. The

four programmes are targeted at academics of one university. Continued interaction and peer learning is indeed happening in Utrecht and Copenhagen, but less so in Oslo and Lund. Evaluations in Utrecht and Copenhagen show that about half of the participants continue to meet and learn with and from each other, even across faculty boundaries. Oslo and Lund find that continued contact exists mainly between colleagues working in the same department. An explanation might be that when participants work in the same faculty or department, continued interaction is more naturally happening than across faculties (Trowler 2008). Another explanation may be found in the intensity of the interactions during the programme. The reflective team method used in Oslo, Copenhagen, and Utrecht aims at forming communities of learners (Brown 1994). It may be that when these teams operate more often, the community is stronger, and the participants feel the desire to maintain contact. Other possible explanations could be the amount of opportunities for building relationships, for instance, in off-campus meetings, or in formalized meetings that bring former participants together because of their role.

In summary, building a network of like-minded colleagues working on enhancement of education is not easy to do. Intensive interactions in a series of small group meetings, combined with continued support in bringing people together, help to sustain contacts long after the programme ends.

7 LESSONS THAT CAN BE LEARNED

We summarize the lessons that can be learned from the experiences with educational leadership trajectories in five research-intensive universities. We asked two questions: What are the main formats of faculty development for educational leadership in research-intensive universities? What are the perceived gains and challenges of these trajectories?

What are the main formats of faculty development for educational leadership? There seem to be two major routes to the development of the educational leadership programmes, with consequences for the format. The first route starts at the central level of the university, perhaps with involvement of the Human Resources department. The programmes in Oslo and Copenhagen are examples of this route. An important driver is the aspiration to enhance the quality of leadership in the university and to offer academics in leadership positions the opportunity to develop their leadership skills in the university context. The university teaching and learning strategy, especially the need to improve the status of teaching

compared to research, adds the drive to develop a programme especially for educational leaders. The second route starts bottom-up, in which deans or the leaders themselves, or the Educational development unit, recognize a need for professional development for educational leaders. In this route, the content is more focused on leading educational innovations. The Utrecht and Lund programmes are examples of this second route.

Both routes lead to different content and formats. The first route leads to programmes focusing on leadership skills. Citing Oslo's example, 'to perform adequately, leaders need to understand themselves, their role and their influence on the environment'. Because leaders are busy, a programme of 80 hours seems long enough. To accommodate the specific tasks of educational leaders, parts of the programme are tailored to the university's teaching and learning strategy, and, as in Copenhagen's programme, topics in the area of curriculum design and curriculum development are added. The second route leads to programmes focusing on leading educational innovation. Educational leaders in these programmes are apparently willing to invest much more time, around 200 hours. Their role as change agent is central in the programme. In the Lund programme, the emphasis is on learning about leadership of educational innovation, while Utrecht takes the knowledge needed for smart educational change as point of departure. We might have exaggerated the differences. These distinctions are formulated in very general terms, and there is perhaps more overlap than is visible in the descriptions of the trajectories.

A third route, that does not result in a programme for a group of colleagues, is Edinburgh's individual CPD approach. The driver was a national development, the UK Professional Development Framework, which was embraced by the central level of the university.

8 PERCEIVED GAINS AND CHALLENGES

The formats of the educational leadership programmes in Utrecht, Lund, Oslo, and Copenhagen share the same characteristics, except for the duration: the aims of the programmes are in line with the concerns that participants have in their daily practice, they use a reflective approach, they provide the participants with input and feedback from experts and experienced leaders, they invite and expect active involvement of the participants, and they are embedded in the university organization.

Most of these characteristics also apply to the individual approach at Edinburgh. The main difference is that participants are not brought

together in a group to form a community of learners, although participants could join in any faculty development activity offered by the University or others.

We can infer that the five core features (Desimone 2009) have been attended to in the design of the programmes. Desimone claims that formats with these features are effective professional development programmes. According to the available evaluations, all five trajectories are received positively at the universities. Participants are excited about what they have gained from partaking, for instance, increased authority as educational expert with their colleagues, confidence, inspiration, and skills for being a better leader, and a network of like-minded colleagues. For some trajectories, impact on the quality of education and on continued innovation of teaching and learning has been reported, and HR policies have changed. We can conclude that these trajectories are effective professional development opportunities.

Challenges remain at the level of the programmes, at the individual level of the participants, and at the organizational level.

The programmes are evaluated mainly at the first of the four levels of evaluation of training programmes identified by Kirkpatrick: satisfaction of the participants (Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick 2006). Kirkpatrick's other levels of evaluation are learning, behaviour, and results. The evaluation of the Utrecht programme looks also at the levels of behaviour and results (Grunefeld et al. 2015). More thorough evaluation of the effects of the programmes and especially of the processes that lead to these effects could help us understand better why these formats work. Desimone (2009) and others (e.g. van Driel et al. 2012; Wayne et al. 2008) propose to look for a theory of change underlying the programmes. Van Driel et al. (2012) especially recommend looking at the role of the facilitators, which could be interesting because in some of the trajectories the participants are particularly positive about them.

Challenges at the individual level, the level of the participants, are the time investment and the rewards of participation. As mentioned before, the time participants invest is very different in the five trajectories. What makes it possible that some programmes can require 200 hours (and more), while other programmes need to restrict the time investment to 80 hours? Is it the rewards that make the difference? At Utrecht, it is considered an honour to have been selected for the programme, and participants report having gained authority among their colleagues. Participants at Lund report increased confidence and recognition as leaders. To what extent is the

content of the programme and the role of the facilitators important for the motivation to spend time? Another challenge at the individual level that deserves further research is the actual learning that takes place. What is the effect of the important reflective activities? Have knowledge and skills of the participants increased, and how do they apply their new knowledge? Do they continue to deliberately seek opportunities to improve their performance?

At the organization level, the goal to establish an inspirational network of professionals in leading education is difficult to achieve in a research-focused university, as is making time for participating in a programme in the busy agenda of educational leaders. A rather long duration of a programme provides many opportunities for the participants to get to know each other, which makes continued interaction after the programme ends more likely. Peer learning in the learning groups (reflective teams) seems also a good way to develop longer-lasting contacts within the university. Still, the forming of a network to which most participants belong is not easily achieved. In a study of academic middle manager's experience of organizational working conditions at the University of Copenhagen, Harboe et al. (Harboe et al. 2016) found that a category of leaders experience a feeling of being overloaded and isolated, and that these leaders had not been participating in a network with other leaders, or in a leadership development course, which could have provided them with tools to tackle the pressures (Harboe et al. 2016). Further research could be helpful. From the examples in Utrecht and Copenhagen, we learn that administrative support for organizing network meetings seems to be an essential requirement.

9 CONCLUSIONS

This chapter showed that, in these five universities, the professional development trajectories support educational leaders in their work on leading and enhancement of teaching and learning. We have seen that the differences in content are substantial. The three areas that are seen as important for educational leaders, personal leadership skills, change processes, and higher education pedagogy and curriculum design, are emphasized in different ways. The choices in the design of the programmes are surprisingly similar: key activities are reflection in a peer group, exchanging experiences and learning from experienced and expert guests, and a vital role for the facilitators as coach in the whole process. It is remarkable that both durations

of 80 hours and 200 hours are perceived as challenging for the busy agenda of educational leaders, but also appreciated as a valuable investment.

The evaluations show that the investment in faculty development for teaching and educational leadership certainly has had positive effects. We have seen that in the five universities in our study, the drive to strengthen the leadership leads to different programmes than the desire to enhance the quality of education. The challenge for research-intensive universities is to choose their own route to establish a trajectory for educational leaders.

Acknowledgements We thank participants, designers, and facilitators at the five universities and in the network that brought us together, for their help in gathering information about faculty development for educational leadership at their universities.

REFERENCES

- Bolden, R., Gosling, J., O'Brien, A., Peters, K., Ryan, M. K., Haslam S. A., & Winkleman, K. (2012). *Academic leadership: Changing conceptions, identities, and experiences in UK higher education*. Leadership Foundation for Higher Education. Retrieved from <https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle/10871/15098>
- Boyer, E. L. (1997). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Brown, A. L. (1994). The advancement of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 23, 4–12. doi:10.3102/0013189X023008004
- Bryman, A. (2007). Effective leadership in higher education: A literature review. *Studies in Higher Education*, 32, 693–710. doi:10.1080/03075070701685114
- Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38, 181–199. doi:10.3102/0013189X08331140
- Eraut, M. (1994). *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Ericsson, K. A. (2006). The influence of experience and deliberate practice on the development of superior expert performance. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 683–703). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Feltovich, P. J., Prietula, M. J., & Ericsson, K. A. (2006). Studies of expertise from a psychological perspective. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 41–67). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample

- of teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38, 915–945. doi:10.3102/00028312038004915
- Gibbs, G., Knapper, C., & Piccinin, S. (2008). Disciplinary and contextually appropriate approaches to leadership of teaching in research-intensive academic departments in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 62, 416–436. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00402.x
- Gibbs, G., Knapper, C., & Piccinin, S. (2009). *Departmental leadership of teaching in research-intensive environments*. London: Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Goodall, A. H. (2006). Should top universities be led by top researchers and are they? A citations analysis. *Journal of Documentation*, 62, 388–411. doi:10.1108/00220410610666529
- Goodall, A. H., McDowell, J. M., & Singell, L. D. (2014). *Leadership and the research productivity of university departments*. IZA discussion paper. Retrieved from <http://www.amandagoodall.com/MasterJune192015.pdf>
- Grunefeld, H., van Tartwijk, J., Jongen, H., & Wubbels, T. (2015). Design and effects of an academic development programme on leadership for educational change. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 20, 306–318. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2015.1068779
- Guskey, T. R. (2003). What makes professional development effective? *Phi Delta Kappa*, 84, 748–750.
- Harboe, T., Østerberg Rump, C., Seiden Hyldegård, J., & Bruun, J. B. (2016). *Tracing a hidden management reform within academic middle management?* Paper presented at the ASHE Conference, Columbus, November.
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 33–49. doi:10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U
- Hubball, H., Clarke, A., Huang Hoon, C., & Grimmett, P. (2015). The scholarship of educational leadership in research-intensive university contexts: Implications for promotion and tenure supervision. *Asian Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 5, 92–107.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L., & Kirkpatrick, J. D. (2006). *Evaluating training programmes: The four levels* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Knight, P. T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Departmental leadership in higher education*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Korthagen, F. A. J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- LERU Mission. (2016). Retrieved November 30, from <http://www.leru.org/index.php/public/about-leru/mission/>

- Mann, K., Gordon, J., & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and reflective practice in health professions education: A systematic review. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 14*, 595–621. doi:[10.1007/s10459-007-9090-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10459-007-9090-2)
- Marsh, H. W., & Hattie, J. (2002). The relation between research productivity and teaching effectiveness: Complementary, antagonistic, or independent constructs? *Journal of Higher Education, 73*, 603–641. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1558435>
- Mårtensson, K., & Roxå, T. (2016). Leadership at a local level—Enhancing educational development. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 44*, 247–262. doi:[10.1177/1741143214549977](https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549977)
- McDaniel, M. A., Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1988). Job experience correlates of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 73*, 327–330. doi:[10.1037/0021-9010.73.2.327](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.73.2.327)
- Milburn, P. C. (2010). The role of programme directors as academic leaders. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 11*, 87–95. doi:[10.1177/1469787410365653](https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787410365653)
- Qamar uz Zaman, M. (2004). *Review of the academic evidence on the relationship between teaching and research in higher education*. London: Department for Education and Skills.
- Raines, S. C., & Alberg, M. S. (2003). The role of professional development in preparing academic leaders. *New Directions for Higher Education, 124*, 33–39. doi:[10.1002/he.128](https://doi.org/10.1002/he.128)
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Temple Smith.
- Scott, G., Coates, H., & Anderson, M. (2008). *Learning leaders in times of change: Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education*. Australian Council for Educational Research, ALTC for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. Retrieved from http://research.acer.edu.au/higher_education/3
- Spendlove, M. (2007). Competencies for effective leadership in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Management, 21*, 407–417. doi:[10.1108/09513540710760183](https://doi.org/10.1108/09513540710760183)
- Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., & Gelula, M. (2006). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education: BEME guide no. 8. *Medical Teacher, 28*, 497–526. doi:[10.1080/01421590600902976](https://doi.org/10.1080/01421590600902976)
- Trowler, P. (2008). *Cultures and change in higher education: Theories and practices*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- van Driel, J. H., Meirink, J. A., van Veen, K., & Zwart, R. C. (2012). Current trends and missing links in studies on teacher professional development in science education: A review of design features and quality of research. *Studies in Science Education, 48*, 129–160. doi:[10.1080/03057267.2012.738020](https://doi.org/10.1080/03057267.2012.738020)
- van Veen, K., Zwart, R. C., & Meirink, J. A. (2012). What makes teacher professional development effective? A literature review. In M. Kooy & K. van Veen

- (Eds.), *Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 3–21). New York: Taylor and Francis.
- Vilkinas, T., & Ladyshewsky, R. K. (2012). Leadership behaviour and effectiveness of academic program directors in Australian universities. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 40, 109–126. doi:[10.1177/1741143211420613](https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143211420613)
- Wayne, A. J., Yoon, K. S., Zhu, P., Cronen, S., & Garet, M. S. (2008). Experimenting with teacher professional development: Motives and methods. *Educational Researcher*, 37, 469–479. doi:[10.3102/0013189X08327154](https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X08327154)
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolverton, M., Ackerman, R., & Holt, S. (2005). Preparing for leadership: What academic department chairs need to know. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27, 227–238. doi:[10.1080/13600800500120126](https://doi.org/10.1080/13600800500120126)

Hetty Grunefeld is an educational developer at Utrecht University, the Netherlands, and has 15 years of experience in facilitating the Utrecht Educational Leadership programme. Her interests are curriculum development, change processes and quality enhancement in higher education.

Frans Prins is an associate professor at the Department of Education and at the Educational Development and Training group of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences, Utrecht University, the Netherlands. His research interests include the effective use of feedback, fostering learner's motivation and self-regulation in primary, secondary and higher education.

Jan van Tartwijk is a Professor of Education at Utrecht University, the Netherlands, and Chair of the University's Graduate School of Teaching and the Educational Development and Training group of the Faculty of Social and Behavioural Sciences. In his research, he focuses, among others, on teacher education and the development of teacher expertise.

Rob van der Vaart is Emeritus Professor at Utrecht University, the Netherlands. Dr van der Vaart is the former Dean of University College Utrecht (UCU) and the former Vice-Rector for Learning and Teaching of Utrecht University.

Daphne Loads is an academic developer in the Institute for Academic Development at the University of Edinburgh, the UK. Daphne has professional qualifications in social work, counselling and teaching in higher education. Daphne is a Senior Fellow of the Higher Education Academy. Her research interests include academic identities and arts-enriched professional development.

Jon Turner is the Director of the Institute for Academic Development (IAD) at the University of Edinburgh. The IAD provides university-level support for teaching, learning and researcher development, including direct support for students and staff and support for enhancement and innovation in curriculum development, the student and researcher experience. Following a PhD and postdoctoral in petroleum geology, Jon established the Postgraduate Transferable Skills Unit at Edinburgh and has worked with many different institutions, in the UK and internationally.

Katarina Mårtensson is a senior lecturer and academic developer at AHU, the Division for Higher Education Development, Lund University, Sweden. She has a special research interest in academic development, organizational culture and leadership.

Anne Marthe Nilsen Gibbons is a senior adviser at the University of Oslo (UiO), Norway, and has been involved in leadership development for research and educational leaders since 2008. She has been responsible for the university's educational leadership programme and is currently coordinating one of the research leadership programmes at UiO.

Thomas Harboe is a Director of Teaching Learning Unit Social Sciences at UCPH, Denmark. He has a special research interest in issues related to educational middle management in higher education. He is involved in the leadership programme at UCHP, both as a teacher and a programme designer.

Karen Poder is the Head of Section in the section Skills & Leadership Development, HR & Organization, UCPH, Denmark. She develops and conducts leadership development programmes and training for academic leaders at all levels at the university.

Theo Wubbels is Emeritus Professor of Education at the Department of Education of Utrecht University. His main research interests developed from the pedagogy of physics education via problems and supervision of beginning teachers and teaching and learning in higher education to studies of learning environments, specifically interpersonal relationships in education.