



This is a pre peer-reviewed, pre-print (draft pre-refereeing) version of the following submitted document and is licensed under All Rights Reserved license:

Vare, Paul ORCID: 0000-0003-3182-9105 (2017) Developing and measuring educator competence in Education for Sustainable Development. In: UKFIET Learning and Teaching for Sustainable Development: Curriculum, Cognition and Context, 5 - 7 September 2017, Oxford University. (Submitted)

EPrint URI: <https://eprints.glos.ac.uk/id/eprint/7190>

Disclaimer

The University of Gloucestershire has obtained warranties from all depositors as to their title in the material deposited and as to their right to deposit such material.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation or warranties of commercial utility, title, or fitness for a particular purpose or any other warranty, express or implied in respect of any material deposited.

The University of Gloucestershire makes no representation that the use of the materials will not infringe any patent, copyright, trademark or other property or proprietary rights.

The University of Gloucestershire accepts no liability for any infringement of intellectual property rights in any material deposited but will remove such material from public view pending investigation in the event of an allegation of any such infringement.

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR TEXT.

A Rounder sense of Purpose: developing and measuring educator competences in Education for Sustainable Development

Dr Paul Vare, University of Gloucestershire

UKFIET Conference, University of Oxford, 5-7 September, 2017

Abstract: A Rounder Sense of Purpose is an EU-funded project that is developing an accredited framework of competences in education for sustainable development (ESD) based on the UNECE ESD competences. A key issue for the project is assessing the learning of those who seek to gain these competences. This paper outlines the project approach to assessment and introduces a strand of research that is investigating the concept of horizontal and vertical dialogue as a means of identifying change in learners' affective development.

Introduction

Championing a socially and environmentally sustainable form of development has implications for both what is taught in our schools and the way that education is conducted. This highlights the need for teachers who have the competence to teach education for sustainable development (ESD).

Ahead of the United Nations Decade for Sustainable Development (ESD) the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) prepared a strategy for ESD and a set of indicators to facilitate the monitoring of progress in the implementation of the strategy. At the first reporting meeting in Belgrade, 2007, it was noted that a particular 'bottleneck' in the implementation of the strategy was the lack of teachers who had the competence to teach ESD. This led UNECE to set up an Expert Group to develop a framework of educator competences for ESD.

The UNECE work made reference to the work of the CSCT (Curriculum, Sustainable development, Competences, Teacher training) Project (Sleurs 2008). The resulting framework of 39 competences was hailed as a major contribution to United Nations Decade for Sustainable Development. The competences themselves are presented in a matrix of three columns and four rows.

The column headings represent essential characteristics of ESD, namely:

- a. A holistic approach, which seeks integrative thinking and practice
- b. Envisioning change, which explores alternative futures, learns from the past and inspires engagement in the present; and
- c. Achieving transformation, which serves to change in the way people learn and in the systems that support learning.

The UNECE framework, however, remains a largely theoretical tool that has not been tested against other pressing economic and educational priorities or translated into agreed, measurable learning outcomes for educators.

The RSP Project

Using the UNECE competences as a starting point A Rounder Sense of Purpose (RSP) is a three-year, EU-funded project that sets out to develop an accredited framework of educator competences in (ESD). for in-service and pre-service educators working in formal and non-formal settings. This is being tested through bespoke educator training

programmes in six countries: Cyprus, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, The Netherlands and the United Kingdom (see Annex A for partner institutions).

During 2016 RSP partners worked on distilling the UNECE competences, which included reducing the number, removing repetition and identifying gaps. This was done with reference to other work in the field including that of Wiek *et al.* (2011) and the RESFIA+D framework of Roorda (2012). These competences have been tested and modified through a variety of events among project partners ranging from conferences to Delphi studies and staff workshops.

The resulting framework of 12 competences (Appendix B) is sub-divided into learning outcomes but it was decided *not* to break this down further into skills, values, knowledge, etc. for two principle reasons:

1. This atomises learning into discreet components that appear meaningless in the context of sustainable development and undermine the notion of holistic thinking that underpins ESD
2. More pragmatically, there is no Europe-wide agreed format for such qualifications, rather each national qualification framework uses its own template for itemising assessable learning outcomes, therefore defining the award at this level of detail would make it more difficult to apply across Europe.

Rather than a detailed break down of attributes, the RSP framework provides a set of *underpinning components* linked to the learning outcomes that in turn relate to the twelve educator competences. RSP also suggests training activities that will help to develop the underpinning components and learning outcomes.

The RSP competences can be applied to various ISCED¹ levels; the RSP partners agreed on running programmes from Levels 4 to 7. At any given level there are three *stages*, which might be defined as 'degrees of engagement'. The first of these stages is simply an acceptable level of participation in any given training programme related to the framework, the second stage requires a demonstration of some practical application of the competences while the third stage calls for an effort to facilitate change in others or within one's work setting.

At the time of writing project partners are in the process of developing pilot training programmes for a total of approximately 400 pre-service and in-service educators. These were scheduled initially to begin early in 2017 but will now start in October.

Assessing the learning

A key issue for project partners is the development of assessment tools and techniques that align with the pedagogical approaches being promoted by the competence training programmes. In discussion with learners on a small pilot programme run in the UK in 2017, it was agreed that assessment would include:

- Presentation and discussion of one's work with the competences including a question and answer session

¹ International Standard Classification of Education

- An assessment of the learner’s engagement in the discussion/question and answer sessions of their peers
- A portfolio (written or other media) that demonstrates a level of engagement with each of the competences

The first two approaches rely on dialogue and reflect an open-ended approach to assessment that allows for external influences and unforeseen outcomes.

Assessment is to be carried out by the student themselves and by their peers with the facilitator/assessor focusing on the engagement of all learners in the dialogue.

The portfolio may be in the form of text or other media; this is to be used to assess the degree of engagement with the twelve competences of the RSP framework in a more structured manner. In this way, the assessment approach lies somewhere between order and chaos, a key feature of successful complex adaptive systems.

The research

This brief discussion paper outlines one strand of the research that is proposed by RSP’s UK-based partner. Other project partners are being invited to respond to this proposal so that ultimately a unified approach can be agreed.

The research question seeks a means of identifying how education in the RSP competences has affected the learners. Students may acquire a degree of knowledge and skill by attending a learning programme but determining the extent to which this represents *affective* change is not straightforward.

Students learning to say – or even do – the ‘right’ things represent what Wegerif (2011) terms *horizontal* learning. For Wegerif, horizontal learning is about how we become socialised into different group norms:

“it does not account for how we might learn to become more aware of our identifications in order to question and transform group norms.” (Ibid: 184)

This learning is a function of horizontal thinking that can, in turn, be detected through horizontal dialogue. Horizontal dialogue, thinking or learning can be applied to many different things but the *depth* of engagement remains the same even as more knowledge is acquired. We might, for example, gain an encyclopaedic knowledge of the UN’s Sustainable Development Goals but this cannot be taken as an indicator of any kind of ethical or values shift.

A vertical dimension of dialogue is also required to indicate the quality of how one is learning to think; for Wegerif:

“...the idea of learning to think cannot be left as a neutral account of processes of socialisation but implies a notion of learning to think well.” (Ibid: 184)

We can detect this quality of learning through dialogue because of the way in which learners *perform* dialogue as if to a third person. Drawing on the work of Bakhtin, Wegerif suggests that all dialogue is addressed to an unseen super addressee or Infinite Other and it is this that offers the vertical dimension. Vertical dialogue (and thinking or learning) occurs

in response to new events and across contexts; it is reflective and therefore challenges existing practices. This dimension can be detected through statements that demonstrate critical thinking and may lead to a consideration of underpinning ethical dimensions and values in any given situation.

Returning to our research question, evidence of growth in the vertical dimension of a learner's dialogue could be seen as an indicator of a potential, if not an actual, shift in values. It is expected that a focus on dialogue will allow us to analyse the extent to which students have internalised ideas and modified their thinking.

An action research approach

Among the RSP project objectives (Annex C) is a commitment to conduct research into the impact of engagement with the competence framework on pre-service teachers. Project partners are therefore in the process of developing a mixed methods action research programme. This will track the assessment process and evaluate its impact in terms of the students' achievement of the specified learning outcomes and their qualitative responses to the assessment itself.

As stated above, partners still need to agree on the specifics of the research; that said, it is currently envisaged that quantitative data will include numbers attending and completing each programme and the stages achieved (1, 2 or 3) by all students.

These data will be gathered from partner organisations with scores being based on assessors' records in light of evidence for each stage that will in turn build upon self-assessment conducted by the students.

Qualitative data is expected to include:

- (a) Peer reviews of presentations and question and answer sessions
- (b) Assessors' reviews of peer engagement in (a) and possibly elsewhere
- (c) Semi-structured interviews (SSIs) conducted with a sample of learners in each setting.

It is the assessor's guidelines for parts (a) and (b), i.e. *how to identify vertical and horizontal growth through learner dialogue in the context of ESD* that is currently under development.

The SSIs will focus on the students' perception of the assessment process itself and will explore issues such as levels of confidence in the process and the degree to which assessment captures or reflects all of the learning gained on the programme.

Next steps

Despite the delayed start (programmes were expected to take place in Summer 2017), some training did take place among a small number of teachers attending a ten-hour programme led by the RSP project team at the University of Gloucestershire, UK. Full-scale pilot programmes are now being planned in the six partner countries with the earliest beginning in October 2017.

NB. As an action project, RSP has a different starting point and approach to the CASE research project that also focuses on ESD competencies (Rieckmann 2017). It is hoped that both project will be learning from each other as work progresses.

Correspondence: pware@glos.ac.uk

References

- Rieckmann M (2017) *Rethinking Higher Education in the Anthropocene – Insights from Sustainability Education Research and Practice*. Research Presentation Arizona State University
- Roorda N (2012) *Fundamentals of Sustainable Development*. London: Earthscan
- Sleurs W (ed.) (2008) *Competencies for ESD teachers. A framework to integrate ESD in the curriculum of teacher training institutes*, Brussels Online at:
http://platform.ue4sd.eu/downloads/CSCT_Handbook_11_01_08.pdf
- Wegerif R (2011) Towards a dialogic theory of how children learn to think in *Thinking Skills and Creativity* 6 (2011) 179–190
- Wiek A, Withycombe L, and Redman C L (2011) Key Competencies in Sustainability: A Reference Framework for Academic Program Development in *Sustainability Science* 6(2): 203–18.
- UNECE (2011) *Learning for the future: Competences in Education for Sustainable Development*. Geneva: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe

Annex A: The Project Partners

University of Gloucestershire (UK) Contact: Paul Vare

Frederick University (Cyprus) Contact: Aravella Zachariou

Hungarian Research Teachers' Association (Hungary) Contact: Monika Reti

Italian Association for Sustainability Science (Italy) Contact: Francesca Farioli

Duurzame PABO (The Netherlands) Contact: Andre de Hamer

Tallinn University (Estonia) Contact: Mihkel Kauger

Independent external evaluator: Prof. Michela Mayer

Annex B: The RSP Competences

<i>Thinking Holistically</i>	<i>Envisioning Change</i>	<i>Achieving Transformation</i>
<i>Integration:</i>		
<p>Systems Competence The educator helps learners to develop an understanding of the world as an interconnected whole and look for connections across human and natural worlds and consider the consequences of our actions.</p>	<p>Futures Competence The educator uses a range of techniques to help learners explore alternative possibilities for the future and to use these to consider how our behaviours might need to change.</p>	<p>Participation Competence The educator contributes towards changes in education that will help sustainable development and encourages their learners to do the same.</p>
<i>Involvement:</i>		
<p>Attentiveness Competence The educator alerts learners to fundamentally unsustainable aspects of our society and the way it is developing and conveys the urgent need for change.</p>	<p>Empathy Competence The educator is considerate of the emotional impact of the learning process on their learners and develops their self-awareness.</p>	<p>Engagement Competence The educator works flexibly and responsively with others, remaining aware of their personal beliefs and values, and encourages their learners to do the same.</p>
<i>Practice:</i>		
<p>Transdisciplinarity Competence The educator acts collaboratively both within and outside of their own discipline, role, perspectives and values and encourages their learners to do the same.</p>	<p>Innovation Competence The educator takes an innovative and creative approach using real world contexts wherever possible.</p>	<p>Action Competence The educator focuses on the development of learners' critical thinking skills and helps them to take considered actions in their own context</p>
<i>Reflection:</i>		
<p>Evaluation Competence The educator helps learners to critically evaluate the relevance and reliability of assertions, sources, models and theories.</p>	<p>Responsibility Competence The educator acts transparently and accepts personal responsibility for their work and encourages their learners to do the same.</p>	<p>Decisiveness Competence The educator acts in a cautious and timely manner even in situations of uncertainty and encourages their learners to do the same.</p>

Annex C: RSP Project Objectives

The project sets out to:

1. Develop a practical accreditation model that teacher educators can use in any European context
2. Develop and disseminate a 'tools and guidelines' document to help teacher educators implement the accreditation model
3. Enhance mainstream educator training programmes with a wider set of competences that will reflect the role of formal education in supporting sustainable development
4. Conduct a thorough, formative and summative external evaluation of the project
5. Conduct research into the impact of engagement with the competence framework on pre-service teachers.