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Introduction

The role impact plays in higher education is a powerful one – how it is understood, captured and communicated can influence decision-making related to policy, strategy and funding, as well as educational planning and practices. This annotated bibliography is the result of a review of recent literature focused on the nature and processes surrounding impact in higher education, with a particular focus on teaching and learning. The literature selected for inclusion provides a flavour of what impact is, why it deserves careful consideration and how it can be identified and captured. An associated National Forum Insight, capturing ten key lessons from the literature regarding impact in higher education teaching and learning was also published recently\(^1\). These publications are part of the National Forum’s work in supporting those across the sector who wish to understand better the concept and nature of impact, and evidence and communicate the impact of teaching and learning effectively.

This annotated bibliography comprises a range of sources on impact in higher education teaching and learning. They include reflective, experimental and policy papers, considering impact and its role across a diverse range of contexts, perspectives and cultures, from departmental to institutional, from regional to international. The summaries address such aspects as the identification of common characteristics of impact, approaches to evaluation of impact, and the socio-political implications of the recent increased demand for evidence-based impact analysis.

Selection and Layout of Summaries

The 40 sources summarised in this document each have an explicit focus on impact and provide useful insights for those wishing to explore the topic. The majority of sources focus on teaching and learning impact in a higher education context. A small number focus on impact in other contexts (research or post-primary contexts) and these were included due to their potential relevance to those interested in higher education teaching and learning impact.

The entries are organised chronologically, to assist the reader in understanding how the area of impact has developed and diversified over the last two decades. Under the title of each entry, a number of descriptors are provided to indicate the context (European, national, cross-institutional or institutional), focus (impact models/frameworks, impact of educational development, research, or policy drivers) and/or type of entry (discussion paper/chapter, literature review, report, empirical research, book). Each summary contains a brief description of the relevant impact aspect of the specified source.

\(^1\) See www.teachingandlearning.ie/insights
The authors propose a framework for evaluation of educational development programmes based on a systematic approach which uses more than one data source, collects data over time and evaluates on increasingly complex and broad levels, rather than solely on participant satisfaction. The authors state that their focus is on meaningful alignment of the strategy both with the intervention and with the level on which impact is intended to be evaluated. They take Guskey’s original 2000 model (see entry 2 for a summary of Guskey’s 2002 version) and expand it to six levels which they support with eight focus questions. A primary focus of this model reflects previous literature regarding the use of case studies and the keeping of self-evaluation portfolios by educational developers.

This article describes the author’s professional development evaluation model originally launched in 2000. It proposes five levels of impact which increase in complexity and scope as each level progresses. Guskey identifies three important considerations, his most important being that in planning evaluation, the plan needs to work backwards from the highest level (Level 5) to ensure focus and coherence as ‘decisions made at each level profoundly affect those at the next’. The author highlights the difficulty inherent in context-specific evaluation as it is so dependent on each individual case. Advice is provided on how to manage this, as well as modes of data gathering, the evaluation questions for each level, and how to measure / assess these.

This article describes how the authors developed a project with 22 universities across eight countries to see if they could uncover evidence through a psychometric system to empirically demonstrate the impacts of teacher training programmes designed to foster a student-focused approach to teaching and learning. The authors identified this as a need as, firstly, there was very little evidence-based data to uphold the view that this type of approach fosters deep student learning, and, secondly, the practice in their large, research intensive universities was for predominantly teacher-focused teaching and learning.
A description is given of how they did this by studying a group of new teachers at the start of their training and a year later, along with their students (as well as a control group which didn’t receive any training), and by using three measures to analyse the data and identify any impacts. The methodology and examples of the tools for data gathering are described.


The approach taken by the authors’ large university to re-position its focus from research to high quality teaching and learning is described in this article. The authors describe the process of implementing the new student-focused teaching and learning policy and what was done to support enhancement of teaching and learning through alignment of the new policy with the institutional management processes and teaching and learning practices to enable this culture shift to student learning and teaching. The development of a multi-layered data collection system for evaluation of the impact is described, using both qualitative and quantitative data and the development of indicators for the analysis. The authors discuss the initial indications of positive impacts evidenced through the evaluation, on the student learning experience and the need for time to be allowed for this incremental change to become more apparent, embedded and sustained.


Donald Kirkpatrick originally introduced his four-level model for the evaluation of training programmes, including their impact, in 1959 (the levels are: reaction, learning, behavior and results). This book functions like a manual for users when designing, developing, implementing and considering the results, of their evaluation. The final level, described as the most problematic for users, is also described as the most meaningful in capturing impacts, as it attempts to identify the degree to which targeted organisational outcomes occur as a result of the training, and links this to accountability. This multi-layered model, designed to capture the post hoc impact of training programmes at various levels of organisational depth and scope, has had a seminal influence on the development of later evaluation models.
LITERATURE REVIEW

The author has written this article to report on four studies, supported by a literature review, which she carried out to explore teachers’ perspectives on teaching with a focus on identifying the occurrence of student-focused teaching approaches. The article reports on the studies, two of which analysed the effect of pedagogical training on approaches to teaching and on self-efficacy beliefs of teachers (one cross-sectional; one longitudinal). The other two looked at how a large mixed teacher group described teaching and the other analysed teaching at an individual level. The author describes how she carried out the data gathering using both qualitative and quantitative methods. Her findings indicate that the impact of student-focused teacher training varies according to the beliefs of the participants and that most impact was achieved in terms of changed practices through regular ongoing training over an extended time frame (in this instance over four months).

REPORT

The New Zealand Ministry of Education commissioned this synthesis report to explore what types of teacher professional development have an impact on student outcomes. Although focusing on the national post primary sector, the issues highlighted resonate with higher education. A theoretical framework and matrix were developed that include the attributes of the professional learning context, its content and activities, the learning processes, teacher responses and the impact on learners. They report evidence that one-off workshops, even when listening to inspiring speakers, rarely have a sufficient impact on sustained changes to practice. Seven elements from their core studies are identified as being important in ‘promoting professional learning in ways that impacted positively and substantively on a range of student outcomes’.

EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

A small scale study, the findings of which are reported in this article, was carried out to investigate the relationship between individual evaluative practices and institutional evaluative policy. The authors ask if there is a tension between evidence for institutional public accountability purposes, and the fostering
of individuals’ reflection. A lack of alignment between these was identified by participants as an issue. A matrix is proposed to reconcile tensions between quality assurance (QA) and quality enhancement (QE), institutional and individual practices, whilst also making a case for separating QA and QE evaluation. The assumed desirability of a uniform approach to evaluation as advocated through institutional policies is questioned.


The authors developed this guide for the OECD’s Programme on Institutional Management of Higher Education (IMHE). It forms a comprehensive introduction providing advice and identifying issues in developing new approaches. The writers identify seven policy levers to support quality teaching with potential for positive impact on students’ learning experiences. Challenges are acknowledged as a result of contextual shifts which are adding further pressures on institutions to demonstrate quality teaching and its impacts both internally and to external beneficiaries. The authors acknowledge that a lack of evidence linking professional development to impacts on improved teaching and learning outcomes may cause policy-makers to question its effectiveness, potentially leading to an undermining of the legitimacy of teaching policies.


An international review of current knowledge of evidence-based research into the impact of teacher development programmes on teaching and learning, and evaluative practices was conducted by the authors and the findings are reported on in this article. This 2012 review reports that there is a fragmented evidence base which focuses on small-scale and short-term evaluations. Nine recommendations are made to the Higher Education Academy including the need for a toolkit. This is envisaged as enabling a common approach, and including longitudinal studies which take a long-term view. This endorses Postareff’s 2007 findings that ‘slow burn’ effects are critical and must be captured in policy to ensure high level decisions are not based on premature or non-robust evidence of impact (see entry 6).

This first of two papers by this author in a special issue focused on impact describes a new conceptualisation for evaluating educational development impact which focuses on ‘evidencing value’. This concept has been developed to recognise the complex, ‘messy’ and multi-dimensional nature of educational development. There is an acknowledgement that professional judgement needs to be part of any evaluation approach and that this can get overlooked, especially in large, complex scenarios. A definition of educational impact is given to differentiate it from the general understanding, and a useful differentiation is made between outputs and outcomes, in particular ‘soft’ outcomes. The author proposes a mix of purposeful qualitative, quantitative and professional judgement indicators, appropriate to the context to enable meaningful evaluation of impact.


In this second paper by this author in the special issue mentioned in entry 11, actions needed to take some control of ‘the accountability/ impact agenda’ and be active participants in capturing impact are considered; the author expresses agreement with Krause and Stefani’s views given in each of their earlier chapters in the special issue where they state that unless this happens, educational development ‘will be under threat’. She proposes eight practical ‘pointers for practice’ providing guidance on how taking some control could be approached, recognising that there is a lack of research on the impact of educational development programmes. A proposed framework for the mix of evidence is given along with an example of a grid for use in capturing evidence. Throughout, the author stresses the importance of capturing multiple perspectives.


This review was carried out for the Division for Science and Innovation Studies of the Max Planck Society in Germany, to explore the literature on the impact of research on society, reflecting the current demands for public accountability, and considering how this can be evaluated. The author expresses a view that society is positively (or negatively) impacted when the results are converted into products or services, and that any evaluation should be adapted to the institution’s specific focus on teaching and research.
the cultural context, and the national standards. A broad range of examples are provided where impact evaluation models have been developed either for national or more focused contexts.


This article was written by the ex-Chair of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Evaluation Committee to reflect on her learning, gained from this role, on impact evaluation. Knowledge mobilisation (i.e. ‘getting the best evidence to the appropriate decision makers in both an accessible format and in a timely fashion so as to influence decision-making’), is a term used to combine what is described as the two main pressures on researchers; firstly, the need for research to inform evidence-based policy, secondly, the realisation that findings need to be transferred to knowledge and therefore inform policy. The paper provides a summary, taken from ERSC studies, of knowledge mobilisation actions which create impact.


This article was written by colleagues from three European universities to provide a review of the literature regarding the impact of staff development on teacher behaviour. The authors cite Kirkpatrick’s model for classifying outcomes of staff development but point out that for capturing educational development impact, more detail is needed to describe the variables of each case and the impact of these (see entry 5). Their purpose is to improve educational development by generating new knowledge regarding the impact of staff development. Variables which affect impact were used to explore the transfer of learning in staff development interventions. They propose a conceptual framework which highlights which variables create optimal impacts in the transfer of teacher development interventions into classroom practice.


The author’s motivation for this article is to highlight the issue that as the role of higher education institutions has shifted to that of ‘learning organisations’, evaluation approaches to faculty development programmes also need to change and develop to reflect this development. The author identifies that,
whereas there appears to be a good awareness of what could be done, not much beyond satisfaction surveys actually happens. He proposes that further evaluation needs to take place and identifies some ways in which this could be approached, satisfying the perspectives of each of the four audiences with an interest in ‘impact’ (teachers; prospective faculty participants; institutional administrators; external funding agencies). Three core points for evaluation design are proposed.


A group of members of the Alliance for Useful Evidence produced this paper to propose that use of evidence (underpinned by research) needs to be improved ‘if public services are to deliver more for less’. The paper considers ‘standards of evidence’ and their impact on research practice. The idea of an ‘evidence journey’ is proposed. This may be quite superficial at the start developing into something deeper and more stable as it progresses and diversifies. Additionally, it is acknowledged that what is considered ‘good’ evidence is dependent on each specific context. Part 6 of the paper focuses on the use and impact of standards of evidence.


This article reports on the authors’ research into students’ perceptions of the impact of professional development on teachers’ behaviour. To carry out their research, quantitative student data was gathered from 15 experimental and 12 control teachers, and 45 experimental students and 27 control students were interviewed. Their research provided insights regarding impact of instructional development on teachers’ behaviour. The authors propose that rigorous systematic evaluation procedures are needed to provide evidence of impact.


A review of literature was conducted to identify how research impact as a term is commonly defined and the types of frameworks and approaches used to capture this. The authors explore the reasons for research impact evaluation and identify concerns of academics that these may create disincentives in certain identified instances. Key features of impact which make attribution to a piece of research difficult
are discussed along with the risks in relying on metrical data. There is a useful analysis of the benefits and risks inherent in the use of case studies. The conclusion states that evaluation of research is useful but only if it does not ultimately have a negative effect on the research impact.


The Context Input Process Product (CIPP) model, developed and first proposed by the author in 1971, is described in this chapter. The author describes the ongoing development of a set of principles to form a framework designed to provide guidance for the study and practice of evaluation. The thinking is that both formative and summative evaluations of projects, programmes, systems and even institutions, short term and long term, can make use of this model, with the underlying principle that evaluation’s most important purpose is not to prove but to improve. It is emphasised that the model is essentially ‘values oriented’, and the author stipulates the conditions that need to be embedded in evaluation planning and implementation.


Within the Australian context, this paper describes how the authors developed a national impact framework as an evaluation tool to enable collection and analysis of data regarding the intended outcomes of professional development programmes. They took Moon’s 2006 definition of impact, ‘a change appropriate to the situation’, and relevance, rigour, context and reliability as their four design principles. Their concept was that, from the planning stage, impact evaluation should be taking place, continuing after the programme finishes, for an extended period, enabling questions to be addressed from the individual to institutional level, regarding to whom, where and why impact has occurred.


This article reports on a wide-ranging study of impact evaluations of quality assurance in higher education institutions triggered by the intensified interest the authors observed for evidence-informed quality policies. Two key points the authors identify as requiring further research in higher education
quality assurance are firstly, that the impact evaluations they scrutinised do not adequately capture teachers’ and students’ experiences and, secondly, the methodology of impact analysis including the measurement of impact is not sufficiently developed. A methodology is proposed which they think would improve stakeholders’ understanding of causal relationships therefore enabling better ‘measurement’ as a consequence. This should help to develop a deeper understanding, causal and procedural, of quality assurance and its relationship to, and impact on, organisational change.


The author and his colleagues were commissioned by the UK government to conduct this review. The rationale for this report is stated to be to explore ‘how to exercise the power (of metrics) to positive ends’, and they propose a framework for the responsible use of metrics in capturing impact. The report acknowledges the significant power of big data and, equally, the dangers of its blunt application and potential for distortion. In particular, the strong support from review participants for peer review is highlighted as a means of supplying metrical data which supports (rather than supplants) expert judgement. The importance of careful selection and application of quantitative indicators is emphasised as these may be very useful. However, in order to evaluate the impacts of research, it is advised that quantitative data should be used as part of ‘a variable geometry’ including qualitative and quantitative data and expert judgement, rather than solely using metrics or quantitative data.


These two authors have published extensively in the field of impact. In this article, they have collaborated to produce an article which acknowledges that the impact agenda is here to stay and they propose that this needs to be worked with rather than resisted. They propose a new model for the evaluation of educational development impact calling this ‘evidencing value’, involving a mix of data within a context-sensitive framework. Their thesis is that professional wisdom and experience must be components of the data used to evaluate impact, moving away from the traditional reliance on metrics. The authors refer to the use of indicators of enhancement to capture the qualitative gains of professional development activity, in particular the indirect ‘soft’ outcomes. The importance of putting aside the assumption that educational development can or should be measured in a cause and effect fashion is emphasised.
A review of the impact of the Australian Office on Learning and Teaching (OLT) funded projects was commissioned asking an over-arching research question - ‘did anyone pay any attention at all?’. The review leader and author of this report identified four key themes for the review in collaboration with the OLT panel and higher education senior managers as priority areas: English Language (recognising the diverse student cohort with greater access to higher education, i.e. not solely international students), Academic Integrity, Learning Analytics (Student Retention) and Graduate Employability. Four purposes of impact evaluation were identified by participants as advocacy, allocation, analysis and accountability; three types of questions (descriptive, causal and evaluative) and a framework design were developed. The author identifies the four evaluation deliverables, provides a definition of impact for the purposes of this, and highlights some key considerations when investigating impact.

The authors, commissioned by the UK Higher Education Academy, worked on this project with a number of key objectives. Firstly, it was to update the 2012 review by Parsons et al. (see entry 10). This is achieved through a comprehensive review of key sources of literature classified according to their research questions. Additionally, the review highlights a number of key outstanding questions which are proposed for further research. Secondly, there is a toolkit framework for staff to use in developing meaningful evaluation procedures, with 12 templates (including questions) supplied. The authors stress the importance of conducting impact evaluation at regular intervals at the start, and during, the programme, but most importantly, at regular intervals, for an extended period once the programme has finished.

The purpose of this book chapter, according to the authors, is to ‘support academic developers to plan, monitor and evaluate their work in a range of ways, in order to provide accurate and usable evidence of effectiveness and added value’. Aspects such as identifying the intended outcomes to enhance student
learning at the outset, as well as activities and outputs, and how students will be actively involved in all aspects of the planning, undertaking and reviewing process are described as key foci. A ten-step model of evaluation is proposed, taking the four-level Kirkpatrick model as a starting point (see entry 5). The authors advise that ideally the evaluator should be involved from the start of the project.


A study of 25 case studies submitted to the UK Research Evaluation Framework (REF) 2014 was carried out by the authors. The aim was to better understand impact (as defined in REF 2014) and explore ‘the potential impact of REF impact assessment on researcher behaviour’. The question of the ‘impact agenda’ and the impact on researcher behaviour of external requirements to demonstrate value is explored. Outcomes indicate heightened researcher awareness of the requirement for a closer relationship with external stakeholders and beneficiaries, impact as part of strategic planning, the best way to complete this REF section (important as it is linked to funding). The authors suggest that the REF needs to consider how to accommodate research for which impacts are not immediate and which are more experimental and innovative, i.e. not an easy fit for the current REF template.


This report considers the responsible use of metrics within the context of open science (how scientific knowledge is shared with the wider world for greatest societal impact) and concludes it is useful in enabling both access to this knowledge and also society’s receptiveness to it. A new framework for the use of metrics is proposed, which the authors have called ‘next generation metrics’. The report observes that quantitative measurements are based on acts of judgement, and that many impacts may not be measurable. The conclusion states that ‘measurement and narrative, metrics and peer review should be treated as complementary tools of evaluation’, with the added point that metrics should support (not supplant) qualitative, expert assessment and that we should only measure what matters, as opposed to what is most easily quantified.

This article is a summary of the two 2017 reports on the impact of co-funded tertiary education projects in New Zealand, written for Ako Aotearoa. The National Centre co-funds projects which are evidence-based, change-oriented and demonstrate high potential to benefit learners. The first report describes an evaluation of the institutional projects funded regionally; the second was carried out on both the regionally and the broader nationally funded projects. The Ako Aotearoa Impact Evaluation Framework was used for both. Reach as well as impact on learners, practitioners, project teams and external organisations are described. The significant increase in impact over time is noted, underlining the importance of continuing to monitor impact after the end of the project.


The author, along with other colleagues, produced this report to support the formulation of policy designed to maximise the impact of future European research and innovation. Of the eleven recommendations the report makes, four explicitly refer to impact. It states that the EU Innovation Policy should ‘rigorously assess the potential innovation impact of new policy initiatives’. The group advises that the upcoming post 2020 Research and Innovation (R&I) programme should focus on the purpose and impact of R&I, rather than instruments, technological readiness levels, disciplines or industry sectors. The report recommends a move away from individual success stories to portfolio analysis of groups of commonly themes activities, the economic and social impacts, with funding beneficiaries required to have a communication strategy in order to report these publicly, both nationally and at member level. The authors propose the EU Commission work on a set of impact indicators for all member states to use, thereby enabling meaningful cross-national comparisons.


A national UK survey of academic staff, reported on in this article, was conducted by the team to identify how the impact of teaching-related continuous professional development (CPD), both on participants...
and on those affected by the participants’ new knowledge and practice, is currently being evaluated for impact. The study follows a methodology derived from Guskey’s (2000) and Kreber and Brooks’ (2001) frameworks. Typically, evaluation approaches were limited to participant satisfaction surveys administered immediately at the end of the activity with a minimal or non-existent focus on the impact on student outcomes. The authors’ two key recommendations are that firstly, attention is given to the upper levels of the frameworks to enable capturing of institutional impact, and secondly, there needs to be work on how to engage students on the impact of staff CPD on their learning.


The authors of this article, from a number of Canadian universities, set out to explore the impact of the 3M National Teaching Fellowship. To do this, the team used Hannah and Lesters’ tri-level approach (micro, meso, macro) which focuses on interactions across levels from individual to institutional. They also adopted Simmons’ additional fourth level (mega) which they adapted to focus on national and international. The paper traces the transformation of a national community of high-quality practitioners into an international federation of national teaching fellows and the impacts this has had on teachers’ professional status, the foci of professional development and the status of the scholarship of teaching and learning in Canadian higher education.


The author uses the national UK university context as a case study to explore impact and the importance of impact evaluation at strategic level. The author identifies that a focus on impact has emerged due to a demand for evidence of return on investment, in line with what she reports as the dominant student-as-customer paradigm. The importance of evaluating impact when ‘driving forward teaching excellence at strategic level’ including the incorporation of a financial perspective is also identified. The report states that, since 2012, national data indicates students have become increasingly less satisfied with ‘value for money’. The need for a structure which enables the capturing of impact pre, during and immediately post an intervention is emphasised.

3  3MNTF – for the recognition of teaching excellence and educational leadership in Higher Education

This author writes about the impact of external quality assurance (QA) on higher education, how an evidence-based approach has become the norm for policy-making focusing on quality assurance. The reality of ‘impact fatigue’ on the part of staff required to prove evidential impact to external evaluators is real, and she states that, even though there has been some research, the impact of QA on student learning remains largely unknown. The paper identifies the gathering of data as a challenge, not because there isn’t any, but because of its diffuse nature, and the need for appropriate processes in which to use the evidence to bring about changes and, therefore, have positive impacts. The author also highlights recent recognition of the importance of professional and political knowledge, as part of the evidence base for impact.


The authors carried out this project in their institution to discover what impact a new university structure introducing academic teaching roles had had on colleagues, using a qualitative constructivist approach. This new focus reflects a TEQSA requirement for higher education teaching staff to demonstrate engagement with the scholarship of teaching and learning as an indicator of institutional teaching quality. Contextual and cultural issues such as senior and middle management leadership capacity and the perceived extent of their commitment to the scholarship of teaching and learning, the related low prestige of this field of study, and the need to manage the shift from a research focus, are all identified as hindrances to the potential for positive impact of this new teaching and learning orientation.


The context of this report is as an action from the 2017 Lamy report (see entry 31) to provide support to universities in realising their full innovation impact potential. A system is proposed in which, through case studies linked to qualitative and quantitative indicators, universities can demonstrate their contributions.
to regional innovations, even nationally and beyond. Four impact categories are identified with indicators, thus enabling universities to use this ‘narrative with numbers’ to explain how impacts have been/are being achieved within their regional context. The long-term nature of some impacts is acknowledged so intermediate outcomes and outputs are evaluated as well as the short-term impacts, recognising the emergent nature of indirect and longer-term impacts. The report stresses the seminal importance of stakeholder engagement, as well as leadership in research, in enabling optimal impact.


In this article, the author writes about the shift in higher education requiring universities to become global, more inclusive and society-oriented, with the emphasis on public accountability and a focus on the impact of their work. The political concerns of ‘impact sensationalism’, ‘grimpacts’, restriction of autonomy, short-termism, amongst others, are identified. An impact framework of six dimensions is proposed to address how impact works in practice across the whole institution; the author asserts that he has developed this framework to alleviate the potential of the UK impact agenda becoming self-destructive for universities, and to focus on impact processes and a broader notion of positive impact. This proposed understanding of positive impact stresses the benefits of permeability between universities and society without compromising the manner in which universities generate breakthroughs and create new knowledge.

For ethical ‘impactology’. *Journal of Responsible Innovation, 6*(1), 78-83.

The author writes about the political dimension of impact – what she calls ‘impactology’. She sees the impetus for this being the demand for external accountability, the pressure this exerts on academics, and the danger of ‘impact fatigue’. The paper suggests that if there is a link of impact to funding, such as there is in the UK system, this may influence how researchers behave in order to access funds and to show return on investment. The potential dangers of use of metrics, i.e. when they are used because they are easier to provide and verify than qualitative data, is highlighted. The danger of ‘impact’ developing as another type of national regulation is also identified. To ameliorate this, the author proposes an ethical set of principles arguing for a responsible use of metrics, and she advocates for an ‘impact aware culture which doesn’t neglect uncountable social and cultural impacts’.

The authors asked two questions for this study. The study used data from three institutionally-focused evaluation studies of their professional recognition schemes from three UK higher education institutions: in what ways does engagement with institutional professional recognition schemes aligned with the UK Professional Standards Framework impact on participants’ teaching values, beliefs and practices, and how does institutional culture influence that engagement. The empirical qualitative data was re-analysed for the purposes of this study. The outcomes revealed that institutional culture drives engagement; however, it appeared that this engagement has little impact on teacher development. Staff reported pressure to achieve professional recognition, given the use of metrics to measure the student experience and their institution’s position in league tables. The positive impacts highlighted are the value of peer interactions and the potential to build communities of high-quality teaching and learning experts.

It is hoped that the summaries presented in this document will stimulate conversations, provide signposts for further directions of inquiry, and help to foster the growth of a common appreciation and understanding of the importance of impact, as a force for positive ongoing learning, dynamic improvement, purposeful development, pioneering thinking and sustainable growth in Irish higher education.
THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF ALL THOSE WHO TEACH

TEACHING AND LEARNING IN A DIGITAL WORLD

TEACHING AND LEARNING ENHANCEMENT WITHIN AND ACROSS DISCIPLINES

STUDENT SUCCESS

National Forum for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education
c/o 19 Dawson Street, Dublin 2, Ireland

T +353 1 6090848
E admin@teachingandlearning.ie
W www.teachingandlearning.ie

DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.11744217