

**Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training:  
Joined-up Policies, Institutional Architectures and  
Enhancement Cultures**

**Paul Trowler (Lancaster University) and Roni Bamber (Heriot Watt University)**

**Corresponding author:**  
**Paul Trowler**  
**Lancaster University**  
[p.trowler@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:p.trowler@lancaster.ac.uk)

**Abstract**

A number of countries, including Sweden and the UK, are considering the introduction of compulsory teacher training for higher education (HE) lecturers. This paper assesses whether such a policy is likely to achieve its aims, and the issues that may arise as the policy is implemented. The paper draws on experience with this policy in Norway, empirical research from relevant studies, and on social practice theory to illuminate the processes involved and identify prospects and pitfalls. The paper concludes that while compulsory HE teacher training may achieve some of its goals, as a standalone policy it is unlikely to achieve them all. HE institutions and their staff are involved in multiple games, with competing goals and different rules. Meanwhile HE policy-making often lacks coherence, with contradictory outcomes in different areas of policy. If policy-makers at all levels are serious about the enhancements to teaching and learning that compulsory training is designed to achieve, the policy must be prioritised, properly resourced and measures taken to develop a hospitable environment for it, both structurally and culturally. The paper concludes with some specific proposals to aid educational developers in implementing such policies.

**Introduction**

This paper addresses three key questions about compulsory HE teacher training<sup>1</sup>:

1. Is compulsory training a ‘Good Idea’?
2. What can experience and research teach us about the likely implementation process?
3. What guiding principles about change processes should we consider when planning compulsory training?

We tentatively respond to these questions using educational development research, and the policy implementation research. There is also a theoretical component, with the insights of social practice theory.

Given the increasing prominence of learning and teaching enhancement in many countries, our analysis aims to inform the work of educational developers who support that effort. While some form of training of university teachers is now becoming common practice, it is at the discretion of individual universities in some countries (eg Holland, Australia, New Zealand), compulsory in others (eg Norway, Finland), while some countries (eg UK, Sweden) are on the route from one model to the other. The focus (eg on Graduate Teaching Assistants in the USA), scope (eg compulsory but limited amount in Finland), and universality of training (eg more extensive in Dutch non-research-intensive institutions), in each country also varies. The paper will be of key interest to educational developers leading such initiatives, but also to others who are charged with formulating and implementing HE policy.

### **Is Compulsory Training a ‘Good Idea’?**

Before addressing this first question, some conceptual ground-clearing about policy-making is helpful, to highlight four issues that impact on compulsory training policy.

Firstly, from a purely rational-purposive perspective, compulsory training is self-evidently a good idea: train HE teachers to teach and they will do a better job than untrained ones. However, the rational-purposive view, seeing policy implementation as goal-oriented and logical is unrealistic – the political process adds complexity:

The system of institutions and practices, values and rules, is a historical accumulation or sedimentation of compromise solutions to past conflicts. (Kogan, 1978, p.117-8)

Kogan and other researchers confirm that the details and contexts of educational policy usually result from negotiation, political bargaining and deliberate or non-deliberate obfuscation and fudging (Ball, 1994):

Most policies are ramshackle, compromise, hit and miss affairs, that are reworked, tinkered with, nuanced and inflected through complex processes of influence, text production, dissemination and, ultimately, re-creation in contexts of practice. (Ball, 1998: p.126)

Any attempt to manage or influence this process requires skill, understanding of the context and, we contend, an appreciation of the theoretical constructs which might illuminate practice.

However, and this is our second factor, HE teaching and learning policies are normally developed on the basis of a poor – and usually tacit - theory of change . For example, Skelton’s evaluation of the English National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (which rewards excellent HE teachers), found that the work of the NTFs and its fellowship holders was uninformed by any explicit model or strategy for educational change, and that they did not recognise the complexity of implementing or embedding such change. This is unsurprising, given the lack of consensus on what constitutes ‘good’ university teaching, and how staff can be prepared for it (Skelton, 2004). The German term *Hochschuldidaktik* describes the discipline of the pedagogy of university teaching

(Elton, 1993: p.137-8), but it is not a clearly articulated or defined discipline. In fact, even the discourse of pedagogical development is foreign to many academic staff (Kogan et al, 1994, p.81-82).

Third, policies can have multiple, sometimes rhetorical, purposes, presented with a great fanfare so that governments and others can say – ‘Look, we are doing something!’ In the UK the following ‘official’ statements express the variety of purposes behind training policies:

[to] raise the status of teaching across higher education, help the UK to become the world leader in the practice of teaching at higher levels, and emphasise the importance of learning. (NCIHE, 1997, Recommendation 14, Para 8.76)

to recognise and reward excellent teaching practice. (HEFCE, 2003)

to raise the esteem in which teaching is held within the higher education sector and beyond. (HEFCE, 2003)

to give a higher profile to the process of continuous quality improvement and professional development for all those who support student learning. (Teaching Quality Enhancement Committee (TQEC), 2003)

[to] provide a reliable means to assure stakeholders of the commitment of staff and institutions to providing an inspirational, challenging, transferable and enjoyable learning experience to all higher education students. (UUK et al, 2004, para 17)

Given the range, and generalized nature, of these aspirations it is unsurprising that they lack any clear theory of fundamental change. The expectations being placed on training are simply too diverse and ambitious.

Fourth, teaching and learning enhancement policies rarely consider the most appropriate points and levels at which interventions should be aimed: should they be at the level of the individual, the department, the institution, the discipline, or where? Exceptionally, there are cases when the level of analysis issue *is* taken into account by policymakers, such as the Higher Education Funding Council for England strategy document (HEFCE, 1998) which finally recognized that there were multiple agencies and individuals attempting, without coordination, to improve learning and teaching - the ‘Christmas tree’ model of policy development: plenty of pretty lights and shiny baubles, but they don’t last long, have little relationship to each other and don’t have any lasting effect on normal daily life.

Governments can foster this approach to policy when they perceive a need, but aren’t sure how best to meet it. For example, in Sweden, training was introduced, like elsewhere, because the Swedish government perceived a mismatch between the current HE system, its practices and values, and the new massification of HE, with increased student diversity and lack of student preparedness. This large aspirational burden being laid at the door of compulsory training is difficult to justify, as later sections of this paper show. Solving complex problems requires much more joined-up thinking. In England, a

new *integrated* approach to funding nationally-led teaching quality improvements is designed to avoid this Christmas tree effect. The Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF), provides funding at three levels: the institution, the academic subject and the individual. Evaluation evidence so far (CHEMS Consulting, 2003) suggests that this strategy has been more successful than previous, disintegrated approaches.

These general points lead us to disaggregate the question ‘is compulsory training a good idea?’ into three sub-questions:

- What is the theory of change behind it?
- What evidence is there that training works?
- Will synergies be found with what is already in place?

Regarding the theory of change, presumably the line of causation runs as follows:

- Compulsory teacher training for all academic staff will lead to conceptual and behavioural change among them.
- These conceptual and behavioural changes will eventually lead to cultural change across the HE system.
- Individual and systemic change together will, longer term, lead to improved educational experiences and better student learning.

These assumptions are expressed in the UK Cooke Report (TQEC, 2003), which states that quality enhancement, of which lecturer training forms part, is about “improving outcomes for students, and indirectly for their employers, and for society and the economy” (TQEC, 2003, Para 2.5). While there is an accumulating body of research on the links between teaching and effective learning (eg Martin et al, 2000; Ramsden, 1992; McAlpine and Weston, 2000; Dunkin and Precians, 1992; Coffey and Gibbs, 2001; Biggs, 1999; Kember and Kwan, 2000; Trigwell et al, 1999; Trigwell et al, 2000), no direct causal relationship between lecturer training and student outcomes has been firmly established.

Nor is there consensus on the concept of learning which underpins lecturer training (Brew, 2003, p.170-171; Barrie and Prosser, 2003, p.1), although many developers subscribe to the links suggested between teacher conceptions and student approaches to learning (Prosser and Barrie, 2003, p.193). With only limited research data, assumptions continue to be made, and correlations are barely questioned. For example, Bourner et al (2003) found that training focuses on the development of the student rather than the development of the discipline, and is, therefore, good preparation for the future of HE, which will concentrate, they argue, on the development of student competences rather than on transmission of the subject.

If this argument is correct, then the compulsory training policy is a good one, both in the UK and elsewhere: making educational development courses like these compulsory will eventually lead to better teachers using a range of methods to develop the competences of a new type of student for a post-industrial society.

However, there are reasons to question the strength of this argument. It emphasises

the need for training to lead to conceptual change in lecturers, since student-centred approaches are linked to deeper learning approaches in students (Kember and Kwan, 2000, p.473). However, far from experiencing deep conceptual change, participating lecturers may query even the methods espoused and take 'defensive action' to maintain traditional approaches (Ho et al, 2001, p.144). There is little research which clearly links effective student learning with improvements stemming from lecturer training. What studies there have been are either inconclusive, making no claims to generalisability or reliability (Coffey and Gibbs, 2000; Gibbs, 2003, p.139); or are small-scale (Stefani and Elton, 2002) and make no attempt to link apparently positive outcomes for course participants to the learning outcomes of their students (Rust, 2000; Radloff, 2002). This does not mean that the courses are ineffectual, simply that significant evidence has not yet been accumulated (Gibbs, 2003, p.130). The most recently published study in the UK (Gibbs and Coffey, 2004), which looked longitudinally at trainee lecturers and their students in 22 universities in 8 countries, concludes that:

- Training can increase teachers' student focus.
- Training can improve a number of aspects of teaching as judged by students (eg organisation, group interaction, rapport). And, most importantly...
- Training can change teachers such that their students improve their learning.

However, the research design of this study, like so many others<sup>2</sup>, instils only limited confidence in the reliability of these conclusions<sup>3</sup>. Meanwhile, more limited but robust studies of, for example, the 'impact' of workshops (Rust, 1998) or of mentoring (Cox, 1995) say little about their long-term effects or about impact on student learning as a result of teachers' changes in practices or conceptions. There is, in short, a startling lack of evidence, of developed theory and of validated research in this area.

Having established, in answer to our first two sub-questions, that there are multiple goals for introducing lecturer training courses, and that there is little solid evidence that these goals are being met, the third question is whether synergies exist with existing learning and teaching contexts.

Trowler's work on teaching and learning regimes in universities (Trowler, forthcoming; Trowler and Cooper, 2002) suggests why it is difficult for lecturer training to make direct impact on learning and teaching. Local departmental and workgroup cultures are powerful, operate against innovation, and hinder the transfer of trainee lecturers' learning back into their departments. Social practice theory tells us that workgroups construct as well as enact cultures, and they develop sets of meaning, discourse, practice and ways of thinking which become 'just normal' to them. The particulars of context operate as a lens through which they see the world and through which practices are mediated.

It is unsurprising, then, that Gibbs and Coffey (2004, p.98) conclude that

[HE teacher training course] trainees reported that in their departments teaching was often not valued and that there was pressure to conform to largely teacher-focused teaching conventions... Change was sometimes frowned upon and taken to imply criticism of more experienced colleagues.

This dissonance between the practices and approaches advocated in training courses and the attitudes, values and practices in departments was also identified by Fanghanel (2004) and Kogan et al (1994, p.76), who found that most staff accept disciplinary conventions on teaching uncritically. The blame for inertia, if blame is to be allocated, cannot only be laid at the door of departments and workgroups however. Educational development courses themselves have tended to be insufficiently sensitive to disciplinary differences (McGuinness, 1997), with over-reliance on theories of teacher development derived from Schön (1987). This has resulted in the mantric incantation of "development of the reflective practitioner", with no consensus on what this means (Eg Ecclestone, 1996; Eraut, 1994; Wellington and Austin, 1996; Bleakley, 1999; Boud and Walker, 1998). As Brookfield says (1995, p.29-130) the reflective practitioner concept seems to mean 'all things to all people...a premature ultimate...[which] stops any critical debate dead in its tracks'. The concept is problematic in many ways (McAlpine and Weston, 2000, p.375).

In particular, the extent of reflective practitioners' power to change things is not generally thought through. Dill (1999, p.139) notes of the work of educational development centres:

While these centres clearly assist individual faculty members in developing new knowledge by which they can improve their own teaching processes, the dominant orientation of these centres to individuals rather than to program or process improvement involving groups of faculty members limits their contribution to "organizational" learning.

So, institutional training policies to enhance teaching and learning mistakenly assume that interventions at one level of analysis automatically have repercussions at another. They make the mistake discussed earlier of not adequately theorising the appropriate level of analysis or the change and dissemination processes. Relying on individual change to lead to systemic change commits the error of 'methodological individualism'; it exaggerates the power of agency over that of structure, seeing individual actors as the prime movers and shakers in social change. Individuals are important, of course; but policies based on methodological individualism do not lead to institutional change. No matter how many reflective practitioners a university has, it will not become a learning organisation unless other things are in place (Kim, 1993).

If individual changes don't translate to the institution, how much less chance is there that a whole country's HE system could be significantly reoriented through an approach addressed at the level of the individual practitioner? We do not reject the concept of compulsory training; initial evidence (Gibbs and Coffey, 2004; Rust, 2000) suggests that it may be a valuable component of learning and teaching enhancement. But, while the pitfalls which we have described may not be completely avoided, training which is rooted in a well thought through theory of change, and following some of the recommendations which we offer in part three of this paper, could help achieve the aspirations of policy-makers more effectively. Even so, we should not expect clear-cut 'answers' to questions, one-size-fits-all solutions to policy issues, or accurate predictions of possible outcomes in new places. Illumination rather than prediction is the best we can hope for: turning up the lights rather than knowing for sure what we will see. We will now move to the second question, of how experience and research can illuminate

implementation.

*What can experience and empirical research teach us about the likely implementation process of compulsory training?*

## **Lessons from the Experience of Implementation**

Common trends across HE systems in many countries (eg massification, market orientation, accountability) have led to interest in what appears to 'work' elsewhere (Bucklow and Clark, 2003, p 87), and this section recounts the implementation experience in Norway and, then, in the UK.

### *The Norwegian Implementation Experience*

Norway has a comparatively long experience of compulsory training<sup>4</sup>. Norway has 10 state-owned universities, with an advisory body called the National Council of Universities (NCU), "owned" by the universities themselves. Each type of institution (traditional or specialist) has a different educational development tradition. However, in 1988 the NCU decided that all appointed lecturers should undergo training to achieve "basic pedagogical competence", of about 100 hours (3-4 weeks).

The policy ruled (Lycke, 1999a) that applicants' competency must be judged on both research and pedagogical qualifications, that new teachers without basic pedagogical competence must document such qualifications within two years, using laid-down evaluation criteria. There were clear gaps between these rules and the situation of universities, with no requirements for pedagogical expertise, nor its manifestation in selection or promotion processes.

Each university subsequently developed its own training programme. The content of the course at the University of Oslo, for example, will be familiar to any educational developer: student learning and motivation; quality; teaching methods; assessment; laboratory teaching; small group teaching etc.

The Norwegian experience of implementing compulsory training is interesting and informative. First, there was opposition to the NCU imposing rules about training. Second, institutional inertia meant implementation in all 10 universities took about five years. Third, the implementation trajectory was very mixed, with some faculties and departments acting immediately, while others dragged their feet. Fourth, course capacity was problematic, so in some institutions requirements were not implemented.

Fifth, there remained issues about the value of training versus time invested. Sixth, different "stakeholders" took different views. Generally, reactions from "top teams" were positive, students felt reassured that teachers were required to achieve basic pedagogical competence, while, predictably, faculty members were divided. Most experienced lecturers tended to be negative, while younger lecturers were in favour of training in principle, but, in practice, lacked time. Following initial ambivalence, the lecturers' union now supports the initiative.

The Norwegian experience provides interesting answers to the question of what experience tells us about implementing compulsory training. We observe the variety of responses from institutions and departments with diverse backgrounds and missions, and between different staff categories. We can also see that the change took several years to implement. What is lacking is evidence of wholesale cultural change, and the effects of compulsory training have been hard to measure. As Kirsten Lycke (1999a, p 13) says: "the quality of teaching is by itself a difficult animal to catch alive and to measure".

### *The UK Implementation Experience*

Although less developed, the experience in the UK mirrors, in many ways, the Norwegian experience. Moves in the UK towards compulsory training have been slower, with three distinct phases towards compulsory training, and full implementation currently planned for 2006.

Phase one followed the Dearing Committee recommendation that all permanent staff with teaching responsibilities should be trained on accredited programmes (NCIHE, 1997, Para 70). The model of professional body-type recognition with voluntary adherence, but strong recommendation, was posited (NCIHE, 1997, Section 14.29), although many institutions acted to gain accreditation quickly, assuming that staff training would become a performance indicator. Following consultations on accreditation arrangements, the Booth Committee, preparing the ground for the new accrediting body, the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHE)<sup>5</sup>, recommended a competence-based approach, specifying 24 teacher competences (CVCP, 1998). The response was uproar: 'competence' carries the negative connotations of low-level development of behavioural skills, not cognitive abilities. The UK experience with competence-based education had not been happy and hardly anyone in HE wanted that experience reproduced in compulsory training.

Many people asked of the Booth proposals "What is distinctively 'higher education' about the proposed higher education teaching competences?" "What is the nature of professionalism?" "What is the status of subject disciplines in this?" "Whose account of competences are these?" "Why these competences and not others?" "How can they be appropriately measured, and by whom?" This reflects the initial response to compulsory training policy in Norway and questions about its legitimacy. In phase two of implementation, these competence-based proposals were withdrawn, and the Booth Committee adopted the existing Staff and Educational Development Association guidelines for course accreditation (SEDA, 1992), which were eventually adopted by the ILTHE and broadly used in most training courses until now.

Following the Cooke Report, which stated that the ILTHE had "not yet made a strategic breakthrough in all parts of the sector" in professionalizing teaching and learning, partly due to not being "recognised and owned by institutions and others in the sector" (TQEC, 2003, Para 9), the accrediting body was merged with other agencies into the Higher Education Academy. The aim was that "from 2006 all new teaching staff should obtain a teaching qualification that incorporates agreed professional teaching standards" (TQEC, 2003). The third stage was consultation on a framework for these teaching standards, which will underpin future requirements and provision.

The UK and Norwegian experiences tend to confirm what social practice theory tells us to expect: that members of the 'small and different worlds' (Clark, 1987, 1997) for whom the compulsory training initiative is relevant will receive, interpret and implement it in very different ways. This applies both to the process of implementation and the content of courses: for example, a recent survey of Scottish institutions revealed that accredited courses varied widely in approach, content, support mechanisms, assessment and delivery methods (Bamber et al, forthcoming).

### **Lessons from Empirical Research**

Bamber's study (2002, 2005) of the reception of the proposal that *new* lecturers be teacher trained confirms this pattern. Her questionnaire survey of educational developers in 93 UK HE institutions found that:

- More prestigious universities lacked management cultures and practices to consistently implement such a proposal.
- Leaders of HEIs were generally positive about the proposal, as in Norway, but this support was often rhetorical, rather than real or resourced. More prestigious universities tended not to prioritise the initiative, focusing on research more than teaching.
- Heads of Department (HoDs) were often more circumspect than 'top teams', but there was, again, great diversity, with some for, some against, and others lukewarm towards training. This was because HoDs balance different priorities and try to help their department 'win' in a number of competing games. Again, the diversity of departmental response mirrors the Norwegian experience.
- HoDs have the power to hamper policy change and, despite the increasing influence of external and institutional forces, the department is an important factor:
- New academic staff themselves were similarly mixed, although generally positive. But time pressures moderated the translation of this into enthusiastic participation in courses, like in Norway.

Bamber concludes that:

The devil is in the detail...rather than uniformity of provision, the diversity of values and purposes in different types of institution is reflected in a diversity of attitudes and approaches to training: the size of the course, and the levels of support among senior managers, heads of department and among new lecturers themselves. (2002, p.433)

This is very significant for the implementation process. To reiterate our earlier points, the main problem is that individual teachers have limited "elbow-room" to make changes in

their teaching. The departmental, disciplinary and institutional context constrains practices, creating inertia and acting as a refractive prism which bends the light of policy and so shapes the effects of such courses, and how they are understood, implemented and practised. The detail of provision needs to vary from place to place, and to be congruent with what is already there (Healey and Jenkins, 2003).

Research on other types of policy implementation confirm these findings. For example, in their school-based research Reynolds and Saunders (1987, p.44) found that policies made their way up and down an Implementation Staircase, as the receivers of policy adapted it according to their own context. An 'implementation gap' (Lingard and Garrick, 1997) between policy intentions and outcomes is inevitable, and it is unlikely that 'target groups can be counted on to act as if they are subject to no other influences than the policy itself' (Kogan *et al.*, 2000, p.29).

We now turn, then, to the change principles that may assist in moving towards compulsory training.

### **What Guiding Principles About Change Processes Should We Take Into Account in Planning compulsory training?**

The argument is not that we should reject compulsory training, merely that if it is to have any hope of achieving the aspirations of policy-makers it needs to be supplemented, in a joined-up way, with other resources, structures and processes, including:

- The need for a *learning architecture* within universities (Dill, 1999), with institutional mechanisms for systematic and effective processes of review, for identifying and spreading preferred practices, for benchmarking, for transferring knowledgeability, and for experimentation. Capturing knowledgeability, expanding it and reflecting on it are the key functions of a learning architecture. It is important to remember that 'knowing' in institutions lies not just in people's heads, but in the tools they use: in assessment proformas, operating procedures, committee structures, policies and codes of practice and unreflective daily practices (Hutchins, 1995).
- The need to sustain *enhancement cultures* within university departments and workgroups. The best architecture can lead to changes in attitudes and recurrent practices, but a culture of enhancement can 'close the loop' of review and practice, linking knowing and the enhancement of practices. This requires workgroups to reflect on their recurrent practices, implicit theories, tacit assumptions and conventions of appropriateness, and to engage in a struggle to change them if necessary. The most effective approach is to focus on *solving problems* – what they are, how they arose, how they have been tackled so far, and how to reshape practices to address them.
- The need to align a range of institutional policies with clearly identified priorities. Universities have to play several different games with different goals and rules: the research game, the income-generation game, the quality game, the teaching

game... If enhancing teaching is a priority, then (for example) policies regarding appointment and promotion should reflect this. Experience at the University of Sydney suggests that congruence between policies and processes is important (Prosser and Barrie, 2003, p 201).

- And, obviously, the need to provide appropriate resources. As Cerych and Sabatier (1986) reminded us in their now-classic study, without sufficient resources great expectations are rewarded with mixed performance.

The efforts of educational developers, in other words, must be based on our skills as change agents, so that we can influence the environment within which compulsory training is delivered, not simply run the courses themselves. Otherwise, opposition to educational development and resistance to change (Jackson, 1997, p.98) can sink the considerable effort involved in such initiatives in this “precarious business” of academic development (Gibbs and Coffey, 2000, p.39). We now offer some guidance on how educational developers can influence the policy-making process, and improve policy implementation:

#### *For Policy-Making*

- Spell out the policy intentions. Those on the ground often impute intentions and motivations that were never there. Even if these projected intentions are not ‘real’, their effects are.
- Innovations that spread and are successful are usually ‘domesticated’, i.e. shaped to the local context, its practices and discourse. So, give clear guidance to your institution, but leave space locally for departments to influence the shape of provision. Engage in real dialogue with stakeholders about the purposes of proposed changes, and how they can be shaped for their context. Expect a variety of outcomes in different departments, but don’t fold under pressure – senior management support helps here.
- Decide how to introduce educational development policies amongst the array of other, incongruent, policies, such as those relating to research enhancement. Policy paradoxes in higher education are common, and produce unintended consequences and large gaps between intentions and outcomes.
- Plan systemically, not just individually: think about changing systems and structures with the goal of developing learning architectures with enhancement cultures, not just about individual academic teachers. Enhancing teaching and learning requires joined-up initiatives, and resources to support policy. Use your university Learning and Teaching Strategy as a ‘lever’.
- Have a good, well-developed and appropriate theory of change and put it into practice. Amend it if outcomes suggest it isn’t working as hoped. If the focus is student learning (as at the University of Sydney), then work for policies and practices with that focus.
- Dissemination won’t happen of its own accord unless there is significant and evident ‘profitability’ in the policy for ‘stakeholders’, especially academic staff. Put rewards in place.

### *For Policy Implementation*

- Keep institutional leaders really engaged with the policy, and willing to devote resources: support needs to be more than rhetorical, although genuine moral support is important.
- Find and work with good practice on the ground. Avoid any hint of a deficit model, including discursively. For example, use the word ‘enhancement’ rather than ‘development’, and avoid the word ‘competence’ altogether.
- Don’t expect rapid change: there are many forces for inertia, resistance and reconstruction. These also mean that outcomes will not be exactly as expected, and that they will vary in different locations across the system. Significant change takes three to five years to develop and embed (Trowler et al, 2002).
- Remember that the real meaning and picture of compulsory training develops as it is played out in practice – we can try to imagine its size, shape and character, but what it really means will only become evident as it takes shape: the path forms itself in being walked (Machado, 2003).

### **Conclusion**

It is clear from the above discussion that policy on compulsory training can only have a chance of ‘success’ if, first of all, the goals of the policy and therefore the criteria for success are clarified in the minds of policy-makers, and there is some agreement about that among educational developers and others involved in its implementation. Currently there are too many goals for the policy, and they are shifting. But even with clear and stable goals it is apparent that we do not have the evidence to estimate the chance of success. Experience and empirical research can shed considerable light on the issues that are likely to arise in the implementation process, and those involved would do well to draw on the resources already available to illuminate the scene so that they do not fall into the traps that lie ahead. This paper has attempted to contribute to this project, and to demonstrate the importance of cultures and structures in the implementation process. But more research-based resources are necessary: there needs to be more evidence about the effects of compulsory teacher training courses: effects on the practices and conceptions of trainees; effects on their learners and learning; and long-term effects on institutional climates and cultures. The danger in thinking about compulsory *teacher* training is in thinking only about the teacher rather than also about his or her students, their learning, and the institutional and HE system context in which the teacher is operating. Widespread learning and teaching enhancements will occur only if institutions develop learning architectures and enhancement cultures. As the TQEC Report (2003: Para 1.10) stated, a “systematic and integrated strategy” is needed if “a culture of continuous improvement and professional development” is to be supported. There is a challenge ahead for all concerned with this policy, and perhaps most of all for educational developers charged with implementing it within institutions. As an educational developer in the Bamber (2002) survey recommended: “buy a tin hat and claim it from expenses!”

### *Acknowledgements*

We are grateful to Paul Ashwin, Asa Lindberg-Sand and Kirsten Lycke for comments on a draft of this paper.

### *References*

- Ball, S. J. (1994) *Education reform: a critical and post-structural approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ball, S J (1998) Big policies / small world: an introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, 34, 2, 119-130
- Bamber, V. (2002) To what extent has the Dearing policy recommendation on training new lecturers met acceptance? Where Dearing went that Robbins didn't dare. *Teacher Development: An International Journal of Teachers' Professional Development*, 6, 3, 433-457.
- Bamber, V. (2005) *An exploration of the intersection between policy pronouncements and policy enactment, through the study of lecturer development programmes*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Lancaster University.
- Bamber, V., Walsh, L., Juwah, C. and Ross, D. (forthcoming) Diversity in new lecturer development programme: a case study of Scottish higher education institutions.
- Barrie, S. C. and Prosser, M. (2003) *An aligned, evidence-based approach to quality assurance for teaching and learning*. Paper presented at the Australian Universities Quality Forum, Adelaide, June 13-15.
- Biggs, J. (1989) Approaches to the enhancement of tertiary teaching. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 8, 1, 7-25.
- Biggs, J. (1999) *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Bleakley, A. (1999) From reflective practice to holistic reflexivity. *Studies in Higher Education*, 24, 3, 315-330.
- Boud, D. and Walker, D. (1998) Promoting reflection in professional courses: the challenge of context. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23, 2, 191-206.
- Bourner, T., France, L., and Atkinson, A. (2003) Preparing and developing university teachers: an empirical study. *Higher Education Review*, 35, 3, 23-41.
- Brew, A. (2003) The future of research and scholarship in academic development. In H. Eggins and R. Macdonald (Eds) *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Brookfield, S. (1995) *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Bucklow, C. and Clark, P. (2003) A new approach to professionalizing teaching and accrediting training: The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. In R. Blackwell and P. Blackmore, (Eds) *Towards Strategic Staff Development in Higher Education*. Berkshire, England: SRHE and Open University Press
- Cerych, L. and Sabatier, P. (1986) *Great Expectations and Mixed Performance*. London: Trentham.

- CHEMS Consulting (2003) Formative evaluation of the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund: A report to the HEFCE and DEL. Retrieved 7.6.05 from [http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rdreports/2003/rd04\\_03/](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/pubs/rdreports/2003/rd04_03/).
- Clark, B. (1987) *The academic life: small worlds, different worlds*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Clark, B. (1997) Small worlds, different worlds: the uniqueness and troubles of American academic professions. *Daedalus*, 126, 4, 21-42.
- Coffey, M. and Gibbs, G. (2000) Can academics benefit from training? Some preliminary evidence. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 5, 3, 385-389.
- Coffey, M. and Gibbs, G. (2001) *Repertoire of methods* (unpublished paper)
- Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) (1998) *Accreditation and teaching in higher education: consultation paper*. 1/98/13
- Cox, M.D. (1995) The development of new and junior faculty. In Wright, W.A. and Associates (Eds) *Teaching improvement practices: successful strategies for higher education*. Boston, MA: Anker.
- Dill, D. (1999) Academic accountability and university adaptation: the architecture of an academic learning organization. *Higher Education*, 38, 2, 127-154.
- Dunkin M.J. and Precians, R.P. (1992) Award-winning university teachers' concepts of teaching. *Higher Education*, 24, 483-502
- Ecclestone, K. (1996) The reflective practitioner: mantra or a model for emancipation? *Studies in the Education of Adults*. 28, 2, 146-161.
- Elton, L. (1993) University teaching: a professional model for quality. In R. Ellis (Ed) *Quality assurance for university teaching*, Guildford: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Eraut, M. (1994) *Developing professional knowledge and competence*. London: Falmer Press.
- Evans, N (2002) *The Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: institutions, academics and the assessment of prior experiential learning*. London and New York: RoutledgeFalmer
- Fanghanel, J. (2004) Dissonance in university teacher education environments. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29, 5, 575-590.
- Gibbs, G. (1995) Changing lecturer's conceptions of teaching and learning through action research. In A. Brew (Ed) *Directions in staff development* (pp.21-35). Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.
- Gibbs, G. (2003) Researching the training of university teachers: conceptual frameworks and research tools. In H. Eggins and R. Macdonald (Eds.) *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Gibbs, G. and Coffey, M. (2000) Training to teach in higher education: a research agenda. Retrieved 27.6.05 from:  
[http://www.triangle.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=tde&vol=4&issue=1&year=2000&article=Gibbs\\_TDEV\\_4\\_1&id=194.80.32.10](http://www.triangle.co.uk/pdf/viewpdf.asp?j=tde&vol=4&issue=1&year=2000&article=Gibbs_TDEV_4_1&id=194.80.32.10)
- Gibbs, G. and Coffey, M. (2004) The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 5, 1, 87-100.
- Healey, M. and Jenkins, A. (2003) Discipline-based educational development, in R. MacDonald and H. Eggins (Eds.) *The Scholarship of Academic Development*. Buckingham: SRHE/Open University Press.

- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (1998) 98/40: *Learning and teaching: strategy and funding proposals*. Retrieved 24.1.04 from [http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/hefce/1998/98\\_40.htm](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/hefce/1998/98_40.htm).
- Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2003) *Strategic plan 2003-2008*. Retrieved 25.10.04 from [http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/hefce/2003/03\\_35.htm](http://www.hefce.ac.uk/Pubs/hefce/2003/03_35.htm).
- Ho, A. Watkins, D. Kelly, M. (2001) The conceptual change approach to improving teaching and learning: An evaluation of a Hong Kong staff development programme. *Higher Education*, 42, 143–169.
- Hutchins, E. (1995) How a cockpit remembers its speeds. *Cognitive Science*, 19, 265-288.
- Jackson, B. (1997) Managing to Help teachers change: an agenda for academic managers. In S. Armstrong, G. Thompson, and S. Brown (Eds.) *Facing up to radical changes in universities and colleges*. London: Kogan Page and SEDA
- Kember, D. and Kwan, K.P. (2000) Lecturers' approaches to their teaching and their relationship to conceptions of good teaching. *Instructional Science*, 28: 469-490
- Kim, D. H. (1993) The link between individual and organizational learning. *Sloan Management Review*, 35, 1, 37-50.
- Kogan, M. (1978) *The politics of educational change*. Manchester: Manchester U.P.
- Kogan, M., Moses, I. and El-Khawas, E. (1994) *Staffing higher education: meeting new challenges*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Kogan, M., Bauer, M., Bleiklie, I., and Henkel, M. (2000) *Transforming higher education: a comparative study*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Lingard, B. and Garrick, B. (1997) Producing and practising social justice policy in education: a policy trajectory study from Queensland, Australia. *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 7, 2, 157-180.
- Lycke, K.H. (1998) *Faculty development activities in Norwegian universities*. Paper to the NFPF conference, Lahti, Finland.
- Lycke D. H. (1999a) *Compulsory educational training for university teachers in Norway. implementation and experiences*. Mimeo.
- Lycke D. H. (1999b) Faculty development: experiences and issues in a Norwegian perspective. *International Journal for Academic Development*. 4, 2, 124-133.
- McAlpine, L. and Weston, C. (2000) Reflection: issues related to improving professors' teaching and students' learning. *Instructional Science*, 28, 5-6, 363-385.
- McGuinness, C. (1997). What constitutes good learning and teaching in higher education? Views from staff development handbooks. *Psychology Teaching Review*, 6, 1, 14-22.
- Machado, A. (2003) *There is no road: proverbs by Antonio Machado*. New York: White Pine Press.
- Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P. and Benjamin, J. (2000) What university teachers teach and how they teach it. *Instructional Science*. 28, 5-6, 387-412
- NCIHE (National Committee of Inquiry into Higher Education) (1997) *Higher Education in the Learning Society*. Committee chaired by Sir Ron Dearing. Retrieved 27.6.05 from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/ncihe/>.
- Prosser, M. and Barrie, C. (2003) Using a student-focused learning perspective to align academic development with institutional quality assurance. In R. Blackwell and P. Blackmore (Eds.) *Towards strategic staff development in higher education*. Berkshire, England: SRHE/Open University Press

- Radloff, A (2002) Learning to teach: changes in technical college teachers' beliefs about learning and teaching over a two-year teacher education programme. In P. Hativa and P. Goodyear (Eds.) *Teacher Thinking, Beliefs and Knowledge in Higher Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Ramsden, P. (1992) *Learning to teach in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Reynolds, J. and Saunders, M. (1987) Teacher responses to curriculum policy: beyond the 'delivery' metaphor. In J. Calderhead (Ed.) *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* (195-214). London: Cassell Education.
- Rust, C. (1998) The impact of educational development workshops on teachers' practice. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 3, 1, 72-80.
- Rust, C. (2000) Do initial training courses have an impact on university teaching? The evidence from two evaluative studies of one course. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 37, 3, 254-261.
- Schön, D.A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skelton, A. (2004) Understanding 'teaching excellence' in higher education: a critical evaluation of the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29, 4, 451-468.
- Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) (1992) Retrieved 8.10.04 from [http://www.seda.ac.uk/accred/teacher/teacher\\_accreditation.htm](http://www.seda.ac.uk/accred/teacher/teacher_accreditation.htm).
- Stefani, L. and Elton, L. (2002) Continuing professional development of academic teachers through self-initiated learning. *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, 27, 2, 117-129.
- Teaching Quality Enhancement Committee (TQEC) (2003): *Final Report of the TQEC on the Future Needs and Support for Quality Enhancement of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education*. HEFCE/UUK/SCOP (The Cooke Report). Retrieved 25.10.04 from <http://www.hefce.ac.uk/learning/tqec/final.htm>.
- Trigwell, K. (1995) Increasing faculty understanding of teaching. In W. A. Wright (Ed.) *Teaching improvement practices: successful faculty development strategies*. New York: Anker.
- Trigwell, K. and Prosser, M. (1996) Changing approaches to teaching: a relational perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*. 21, 3, 275-284.
- Trigwell K., Prosser, M. and Waterhouse, F. (1999) Relations between teachers' approaches to teaching and students' approaches to learning. *Higher Education*. 37, 57-70.
- Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J. and Prosser, M. (2000) Scholarship of teaching: a model. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 19, 2, 155-168.
- Trowler, P. (forthcoming) The sociologies of teaching, learning and enhancement: improving practices in higher education. *Revista de Sociologia*, 75.
- Trowler, P. and Cooper, A. (2002) Teaching and learning regimes: implicit theories and recurrent practices in the enhancement of teaching and learning through educational development programmes. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 21, 3, 221-240.
- Trowler, P. Saunders, M. and Knight, P. (2002) *Change thinking, change practices: a guide to change for heads of department, subject centres and others who work middle-out*. Report for the Learning and Teaching Support Network, Generic Centre. Retrieved 27.6.05 from <http://www.heacademy.ac.uk/921.htm>.
- Universities UK/SCOP/HEFCE/HEA (2004) Towards a framework of professional

teaching standards. Retrieved 27.6.05 from <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/consultations/UniversitiesUK/downloads/teachingstandards.pdf>.

Wellington, B. and Austin, P. (1996) Orientations to reflective practice. *Educational Research*, 38, 3, 307-316.

---

<sup>1</sup> Most educational developers prefer the terms 'development' or 'education', but training is used here as short-hand terminology to cover both of these, using the terminology of Lycke (1998, 1999a, b)

<sup>2</sup> Eg Coffey and Gibbs' (2000) study surveyed academics and students pre- and post-training, and found correlations between training and improved student perceptions of teacher performance. Their analysis of the research design later noted that the self-selecting nature of the sample left the results open to question.

<sup>3</sup> For instance, one of the instruments used in the Gibbs and Coffey study, the Teaching Methods Inventory, which aimed to measure lecturers' repertoire of teaching methods and their ability to describe that repertoire, was later felt by the researchers to be inadequate (Coffey and Gibbs, 2001: 6).

<sup>4</sup> We are particularly grateful to Kirsten Lycke, University of Oslo, for her information on this experience (Lycke 1998, 1999 a, b)

<sup>5</sup> Further information on the ILTHE in Evans (2002)