



## 3CS FRAMEWORK OF PROFESSIONAL LEARNING – CHARACTER, COMMUNITY AND CONTEXT

### Overview

One of the planned outputs of COST Action 15221 was to provide a framework which would underpin the models proposed. In this section we present the framework.

The framework is presented in two parts. Part 1 is a presentation of the '3Cs Framework of Professional Learning – Character, Community and Context' which was developed by COST Action 15221. Part 2 uses the 3Cs Framework as its underpinning and provides a blueprint for how an institution might devise and agree on a model of support for writing and research, learning and teaching. Part 2 draws directly from the participatory approach which was used by COST Action 15221 to explore alternative models of centralised support.

The '3Cs Framework of Professional Learning' is based on the research findings of COST Action 15221. Throughout the Action all of the work building to the publication of this framework was captured in various documents. Colleagues interested in reading more about the process and the findings are directed to the section entitled 'Outputs, Presentations and Publications' in this FAD. Development toward the 3Cs Framework is also discussed in detail in the chapter entitled 'The challenges of Professional Development in the European Higher Education Area: Targeting success in writing, research, learning and teaching' (Melonashi et al., in press) in *Academic Writing at Intersections in Europe* (Gustafsson and Eriksson eds., in press). The principles of the framework directly reflect, and elaborate on, the Action's Reflective Statement.

### Part 1 - '3Cs Framework of Professional Learning – Character, Community and Context'.

Our Action explored the purposes, processes, values, skills and knowledge of colleagues whom Action members deemed successful against agreed criteria combined with their professional judgement (a link to the criteria is available in the 'Outputs, Presentations and Publications' section of this FAD). These colleagues provided us with data about what motivates and drives them in their work, how they work, the values that underpin their work, and the skills and knowledge that they need to complete their work. We gathered this data through online focus groups and an online questionnaire. We hoped that if we could better understand these colleagues we might be able to suggest ideas around the sort of professional learning that would help all colleagues to achieve similar success and/or their potential.

Our findings suggest three essential considerations regarding professional learning. They are character, community and context.

### Character

Overwhelmingly our data suggest that successful colleagues share personal and professional characteristics. The academic disposition was central to colleagues' success. From the Melonashi report (2020) we know that certain values and traits predominated in our cohort. These colleagues are driven by the values of respect, equality, fairness, integrity. They have a positive attitude, are optimistic, and value imagination and freedom. Key success factors for them include passion for their subject, curiosity, determination, resilience and hard work. They showed

openness to new experiences and rated the ability to problem solve.

Our findings also suggest that the colleagues are hugely intrinsically motivated; they want to learn more, and they want to contribute to and progress their discipline/field. They want to share what they know and what they are discovering, with colleagues and with students. They want to see their students doing well. Intrinsic motivation is central to colleagues engagement in professional/career development across the four areas

From our Action we know that Character - who I am, the self - is central to professional learning. Any model of support, centralised or otherwise should be mindful of the need to support colleagues as individuals. Models should also tap into the very substantial intrinsic motivation that colleagues bring to their work and seek to bolster, acknowledge and reward their individual efforts.

## Community

Our findings strongly reinforce the relational aspects of higher education and of the professional learning of staff working within higher education. The findings show us that while the behaviour, knowledge and values of individuals matter a great deal in higher education all of these individuals need to operate in communities of various shapes, sizes and interests. The majority of academics in our research noted that they enjoy collaboration of one kind or another. Colleagues remarked that co-authoring and sharing one's writing and research was important, that collaborating on research mattered to them, that they seek opportunities to network and to travel in order to share their research and to work and learn in other settings, that they recognise and enjoy teaching as a social act – they want to build rapport with their students, to share pedagogical practice and to gain feedback. Our findings suggest that academic staff ask each other for advice and learn from each other. They emphasized the fundamental importance of sharing their work at conferences and other fora, and wanted opportunities for professional conversations about writing and research, learning and teaching. Working and connecting with others was an absolute necessity in their roles and in their professional learning.

Professional learning must acknowledge and build on the importance of community. It must also recognise that there are myriad communities of which academics are a part. These will include large communities such as international and national communities, their institutional community and their research/disciplinary community. It will also include much smaller departmental communities and niche research communities. In addition, colleagues will play different roles within the various communities of which they are members. In some instances, they will be leaders, in others mentors, in others silent partners, in others novices. Professional learning for colleagues needs to accommodate and support the range of roles that colleagues play in the various communities of which they are a part.

## Context

One thing that is abundantly clear in our findings is that context matters. The breadth and diversity of involvement across our COST Action demonstrated for us that our contexts and settings are vastly different. This is clearly evident in the Action's case study publication Centralised Support for Writing, Research, Learning and Teaching: Case Studies of Existing Models across Europe (O'Sullivan et al., 2020) and in 'The Story of the Action' section of this FAD. Even though the findings show remarkable similarity regardless of context, translating what we know matters in terms of professional learning for colleagues across settings means that we need to take context into account. Certainly, this will mean looking at the national context, including national policy, but it will also mean paying careful attention to institutional policies and strategies, and departmental priorities and goals.

Colleagues struggle with lack of time, competing demands and the fragmented nature of their work. Our data suggest that supporting academics to be successful involves enablers which are either side of the same coin; individual academics and academic communities need support to fulfil their roles but they also need freedom/flexibility/a lack of inhibitors. This is particularly obvious in terms of the sorts of enablers that colleagues deemed desirable regarding research. Colleagues were grateful for research funding and the necessary research infrastructure to fulfil their goals, including, especially, access to scholarship. But equally they clearly acknowledged the importance of having flexibility to adjust their commitments and manage their schedules, having academic freedom and most importantly having time to work on research.

Context also involves a number of practical considerations such as technology, infrastructure and resources – these vary significantly across settings. All professional learning must be situated to be truly effective and to make a difference for the context, the community and the individual. Where there is a lack of complementarity between these three elements it is unlikely that the professional learning will be relevant, applicable or indeed represent good value for money and return on investment. Worse than this, professional learning which is not aligned may have a demoralising effect on colleagues e.g. where a colleague commits to becoming an excellent teacher only to be told by her department and/or her institution that research is all that matters.

## **Part 2 – Towards an Institutional Approach to Support for Writing and Research, Learning and Teaching.**

Against the backdrop of the 3Cs Framework of Professional Learning COST Action Management Committee members proposed alternative models of centralised supports for teaching and learning, research and writing; those models are noted in the ‘Alternative Models of Support’ section of this report.

Using the 3 Cs Framework of Professional Learning here we provide a blueprint communicated as a five stage process toward the development of an institutional approach to support for writing and research, learning and teaching. As noted previously, the approach echoes the participatory process adopted by COST Action 15221.

Note - a scoping/sounding phase might also be useful if a mandate for exploring support across the four areas does not already exist.

### 1. Declaration of intention and planning

- Statement of the aim of the initiative
- Gathering the community (staff, students and other stakeholders) who will explore and subsequently identify/build the model
- Identifying existing policies/strategies which will influence the work – institutional, national and international
- Brainstorming
- Negotiated planning of the phases of the initiative
- Identifying what success would look like
- Clarifying the risks

### 2. Consultation

- Beginning where colleagues are
- Ensuring shared ownership of the process and outcomes
- Establishing what exists across the HE landscape – current models and approaches
- Establishing what exists to date – current practice on campus

- Capturing what would be desirable

COST Action 15221 did this work through an online questionnaire, through face-to-face consultation, and through ongoing conversations. The Action considered the following elements specifically:

- agreement about the process and shared ownership
- establishing a shared understanding of centralised support across the four areas:
  - clarifying what we mean by key terms
  - devising a shared bibliography of the literature in the field
  - concept mapping of what exists at present
  - use of an agreed framework to examine what exists at present and what might be desirable i.e. looking at values, purposes (aims of support - why), processes (what support looks like in action – how), knowledge and scholarship, skills,
  - gathering and analysing accounts of what exists at present in terms of support using the agreed framework, and through focus groups and online questionnaires with key informants
  - gathering and analysing accounts of what might be desirable in terms of support using the same agreed framework, and through focus groups and online questionnaires with key informants
  - collated the findings and presented them as reports and as a matrix.

### 3. Exploration

- Locating the findings in the context including institution mission (values), strategic direction of the institution, and policy (institutional, national and international)
- Sharing of the findings with staff and students
- Discussion of the findings with staff and students across campus
- Capturing reactions to the findings
- Articulating and sharing insights
- Beginning to consider possible models

### 4. Negotiation

- Presentation of draft models
- Exploration of models
- Negotiation re model to be adopted
- Building consensus
- Agreement re model

### 5. Implementation and evaluation

- Planning for implementation of model
- Model implementation
- Model evaluation

## ALTERNATIVE MODELS OF SUPPORT

### Introduction to Alternative Models

The following models were devised during the working group and management committee meetings held by the Action in Bratislava in February 2020.

Each model draws from all of the work completed across the lifetime of the Action and reported on in this FAD; the models should be considered firmly in the context of the overall work of the Action.

The models are examples of how an institution might use the learning from the Action and the 3Cs Framework to produce an alternative approach to support for writing, research, learning and teaching. The models are not prescriptive; rather they are explorations of how the Action learning and outputs could be conceived as an alternative approach.

Please note: The colleagues who are recorded as developing the models are those groups of colleagues who worked together in Bratislava (Feb 2020) to devise the models on that day. Their outputs go some way towards capturing the efforts and articulating some of the learning of all the active COST Action members over the lifetime of the Action. We are grateful to these colleagues for developing these models in Bratislava and we acknowledge the broader collective efforts of COST Action members since the Action began in October 2016 which have led to the production of these models.

### MODEL 1 – ‘CENTRE FOR ACADEMIC SUPPORT AND RECOGNITION’

#### Purpose of model

To support

- writing and research, learning and teaching
- professional development of academic and administrative staff, particularly early career investigators.

#### Summary of model

The Centre for Academic Support and Recognition is a university unit which supports community and networking among academic and administrative staff, with a focus on communication and sharing of ideas and achievements. The Centre supports academic writing, teaching and learning skills (through appropriate training for improving these skills - courses, workshops, etc.), and builds research capacity. The Centre also provides financial support for researchers for conducting research and associated essential activity (experiments, travel, pre- or co-financing participation in international projects, etc.) and for rewarding researchers work (e.g. through awards and prizes).

#### Underlying values of the model

- Transparency and trustworthiness
- Focus on the individual – personal and professional development
- Importance of community – emphasis on interpersonal relationships and good working atmosphere
- Parity of esteem between writing and research, learning and teaching

- Synergy between writing and research, learning and teaching
- Supporting individual personal results, as part of the support of the community, towards improved institutional success

### **Characteristics of the model**

The model

- has three levels – intra-institutional (between various departments); national inter-institutional (between institutions in the country); and international
- works through transparency, visibility, sharing, collaboration and dissemination of information
- endorses ‘open’ approaches to writing and research, learning and teaching
- offers a range of types of support – information provision, workshops, courses, networking, awards and prizes
- is of significance and is targeted at all members of the university community – interdisciplinary, different career stages (early career, consolidator, expert, emeritus), different types of positions and needs (academic, administrative and management staff).

### **Placement of the model in the organisation, including model sponsors, home department/centre/unit, associated senior leaders**

The Centre would be a unit which works across the university. It would be financed by central/core university funding and governed by representatives of its range of stakeholders. It would have its own director and a team of permanent staff. Senior teaching staff could be engaged/seconded to the centre and included in different centre activities as appropriate and in a range of roles – as mentors, tutors, supervisors, lecturers, workshop/programme leaders etc. When required, expertise might be outsourced or contracted in.

### **Connectedness within the institution, including interoperability with other centres/units, shared territory, common ground, connection with strategy/policy**

The Centre should be recognised by university policy and included as part of the university strategy, in terms of development, capacity building, and enabling recognition.

### **Sample content areas/topics/approaches/formats/processes**

The Centre would offer universal support across the areas of writing and research, learning and teaching. This might include support around teaching (including introductory pedagogical skills and mentoring), support for research (including approaches to research, methodology development and statistical advisory), community building (including social skills, networking, organisational skills, building national/international groups), professional skills (including time management, stress management, etc.), context specific skills (such as English language development). The Centre could also explore approaches with the institution and staff regarding how to provide time and space for professional development.

### **Desired outcomes – what success would look like**

Possible indicators of success might include

- better ranking of the institution due to improved quality of research and writing, teaching and learning
- higher transparency and accessibility of research
- improved student feedback and satisfaction with the learning experience

- increased mobility opportunities, for staff and students, as well as greater national and international collaboration
- personal satisfaction and enhanced sense of fulfilment of both students and staff
- open mind for creativity.

### Prepared by

Bojana Danilovic, University of Nis, Serbia

Gordana Dobravac, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia

Ivana Paula Gortan Carlin, Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia

Bojana Ikonic, University of Novi Sad, Serbia

Lina Milosevska, University of Information Science and Technology, Ohrid, North Macedonia Dorit

Olenik – Shemesh, The Open University of Israel, Raana, Israel

Biljana Scepanovic, University of Montenegro, Podgorica, Montenegro

## MODEL 2 - 'CLL – CPD': CAREER-LONG LEARNING APPROACH TO CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT.

### Purpose of model

The purpose of the model is to identify needs and provide the necessary and desirable support for staff, as individuals and members of a contextualised higher education community, as they progress through their careers.

### Summary of model

The model is designed to provide professional development across writing and research, learning and teaching. It also incorporates other areas such as management and leadership which will likely come more to the fore for many academics as they move through their careers. The model clearly recognises that professional development needs to be fit for purpose and frequently 'just in time' for staff, and that staff need and want different professional development depending on their career stage.

### Underlying values of the model

- Lifelong learning
- Flexibility
- Collaboration
- Diversity
- Inclusion

### Characteristics of the model

The model

- is comprehensive but sufficiently flexible and targeted at individual organisational needs (country, institution, professional/subject related differences)
- cultivates the attitudes, values and habits of mind which underpin success
- encourages collaboration – recognises that the successful academic needs and wants to make connections with others and to be mobile
- is individualised
- is context sensitive – acknowledges that there is no 'one size fits all' - is mindful of the synergies and cross-cutting between topics

- incorporates knowledge, skills and competencies
- takes a holistic approach to professional development.

### **Placement of the model in the organisation, including model sponsors, home department/centre/unit, associated senior leaders**

There is no one-size-fits-all approach in terms of how the synergy between writing, research, learning and teaching should be achieved. However, model sponsors, change agents, participants (university employees) should all take part in the conversation about the placement of the actual model in the university organisation. Changes in placement should continuously be evaluated.

### **Connectedness within the institution, including interoperability with other centres/units, shared territory, common ground, connection with strategy/policy**

Strategy/policy principles should be clearly articulated, accessible to all participants, interoperable, and applicable in everyday or real writing/research/learning/teaching (WRLT) situations.

Challenges might arise from the interoperability of policies, or a lack of understanding of policies. This might constrain the synergy of WRLT. Furthermore, it might hamper the connectedness in and between universities.

Connectedness will be facilitated when researchers influence each other's attitudes, skills and competences, and engage in knowledge sharing. If the leadership of the unit, centre, and university advocates such knowledge sharing, it is more likely to become common practice.

Concretely this might be seen in strengthening participants' links to knowledge resources and involvement in developing innovations in teaching, curricular processes, writing, student learning, and research.

### **Sample content areas/topics/ sample approaches/formats/processes**

- Support for teaching and learning as appropriate for career stage potentially including the following: small and large group teaching, designing courses, curriculum/whole programme design and reform, reflecting on and evaluating teaching, scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL)
- Various supports for research including accessing funding for research, building networks and engaging in mobility
- Technical support and support for technology enhanced learning (TEL)
- Academic writing support including support around publishing (publishing strategies), ethics, English for Academic Purposes, access to literature
- Cross-cutting skills including people management, mentoring, leadership, financial training
- Potential outsourced specialist training and support

### **Desired outcomes – what success would look like**

- Personalised professional development plans for all staff which reflect career stage
- Professional development which is aligned with institutional goals
- Professional development which reflects national and European frameworks
- Institutional success, recognised in the fulfilment of mission goals, through individual and community support and achievement
- Student success and staff success working in a complementary manner and being mutually supportive
- Institutional contentment through care and compassion for staff and students

- Participants dare to innovate or experiment with writing, research, learning and teaching.
- Participants share stories of success

### Developed by

Stacey Cozart, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Peter Musaeus, Aarhus University, Denmark

### MODEL 3 - 'VIRIBUS UNITIS' CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

#### Purpose of model

The mission of 'Viribus Unitis' Centre of Excellence is to raise the quality of writing and research, learning and teaching at the university. It will achieve this by

- raising awareness and clarifying what quality looks like across writing and research, learning and teaching
- contributing to the development and sustainable growth of the university
- guaranteeing the equilibrium and synergy of the academic community across all its activities - writing and research, learning and teaching
- encourage networking, collaboration and partnership between all stakeholders
- ensuring compliance with ethical principles.

#### Summary of model

The centre will offer support for the university community - students and staff in writing and research, learning and teaching.

#### Underlying values of the model

- Collaboration
- Inclusivity and equality
- Mutual respect and trust
- Forward-looking - promoting and encouraging modern approaches and technologies
- Trustworthy, honest and ethically sound compliance and leadership re all Centre activity
- Responsibility
- Capitalising on experience and embracing diversity
- Academic freedom

#### Characteristics of the model

The model is

- oriented towards the needs of the academic community
- open and flexible
- inclusive and supporting of disciplinarity and inter-, multi-, trans-disciplinarity - autonomous
- situated in the local context and adaptable for internationalisation.

#### Placement of the model in the organisation, including model sponsors, home department/centre/unit, associated senior leaders

- Financially supported by the university
- Managed by a chairperson/director, supported by a team of experts, and reporting directly to the university rector/president/provost

- Representative of the university community in academic environment (university members, institutes, students)

### **Connectedness within the institution, including interoperability with other centres/units, shared territory, common ground, connection with strategy/policy**

- Autonomous: stand-alone unit, distinct from schools/faculties, reports directly to the university rector/president/provost
- Integrated in the strategies and policies of the university
- Cooperates with other academic/support/professional units on specific topics (foreign language centres, IT departments, departments of education etc.)
- Addresses both the values and vision of the university and the demands of the beneficiaries

### **Sample content areas/topics**

The Centre should support

- key competencies and innovative methods in writing and research, learning and teaching
- institutional research, and scholarship into writing and research, learning and teaching - data collection and processing
- staff development
- international activities – mobility, networking, international opportunities in writing and research, learning and teaching
- cooperation with actors in the economic and social environment – community, industry, professional bodies, regulatory bodies
- specific skills and competences in both maternal and foreign languages.

### **Sample approaches/formats/processes**

- Provide a range of training and development opportunities e.g. workshops, seminars, courses, programmes for staff and students, in face-to-face, online and/or blended formats
- Create/develop/support virtual learning platforms and other technology enabled/enhanced learning
- Provide individual consultations, mentoring or personalised learning and career counselling, in face-to-face, online and/or blended formats, and provide for planning, curation and capturing of individual professional learning through professional development plans and professional portfolios
- Develop/source methodological and support materials and resources across writing and research, learning and teaching
- Encourage and support participation in networks, partnerships and collaborations – on- campus, national and international
- Cooperate with other institutions who are working in similar areas and dedicated to related outcomes

### **Desired outcomes – what success would look like**

Direct outcomes

- Development/individual growth of staff and students across writing and research, learning and teaching
- Development of the academic community through greater collaboration and networking
- Achievement of institution mission - development of scientific skills, growth in knowledge, enactment of values

- Improved and increased scientific outcomes: better rated publications, more students involved in scientific research, more projects financed from external sources, improved processes and systems, more collaboration and greater connectedness etc.

#### Indirect outcomes

- Increase of the visibility and prestige of the university; university becomes more attractive from the viewpoint of the prospective students and staff
- Raised awareness on the importance of writing and research, learning and teaching
- Development of new disciplines, departments, schools of thinking, areas of and approaches to writing and research, learning and teaching
- Sustainable and supported university community contributing to reduction of brain drain and increased on-campus ambition and pride

#### Prepared by

Basak Ercan, Akdeniz University, Turkey

Aleksandra Figurek, University of Banja Luka, Republic of Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina Ilze

Ivanova, University of Latvia

Maruška Šubic Kovač, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Alexandru Manole, University of Bucharest, Romania

Metka Sitar, University of Maribor, Slovenia

### MODEL 4 - ACADEMIC INTEGRITY– TOWARDS A EURO-GLOBAL ACADEMIC ENVIRONMENT

#### Purpose of model

The purpose of the model is to transform the academic environment into one with local opportunities but a global outlook in which staff would be supported, as individuals and a community, over life-long academic careers.

#### Summary of model

The model is designed to support writing and research activities, and contemporary learning and teaching approaches, through the development and achievement of qualifications, experience and results, over the three career dimensions of early career, consolidator and expert. The model advocates that the three dimensions should be in balance, with a reasonable and efficient share of work duties, support, opportunities, knowledge, skills, responsibilities, across all career stages. It reinforces the need for parity of respect across the dimensions, from openness to new ideas through respect for senior experience and expertise, in an atmosphere of community and collegiality.

#### Underlying values of the model

- Intergenerational respect
- Receptive openness
- Responsible research
- Learner-centre approaches to teaching and learning
- Internationalisation
- Professional and personal development not only in a bio-psychological way but also through sociological understanding as a result of the interaction with students, colleagues, industry, and community
- Continuous advancement in research literacy including academic and professional writing

## Characteristics of the model

### The model

- contributes to research career development
- interconnects all levels of seniority throughout a lifelong academic career
- aims at avoiding the occurrence of generation gap
- respects the values of EU as the space for equal opportunities
- follows the EU educational standards
- better research competitiveness at global level
- addresses social and economic needs.

### Placement of the model in the organisation, including model sponsors, home department/centre/unit, associated senior leaders

Home department.

### Connectedness within the institution, including interoperability with other centres/units, shared territory, common ground, connection with strategy/policy

Networked with interested parties including similar research centres, local authorities, public authorities responsible for research and education, various branches of industry, non-profit sector.

### Sample content areas/topics/ sample approaches/formats/processes

- Development of strategic documentation aimed at identifying and specifying needs and distinctiveness of any stage of academic career development
- Establishment of centres for the development and support of key competences across writing and research, teaching and learning
- Maintaining a focus on addressing the needs of the society and industry across writing and research, learning and teaching
- Scholarly research sustainability
- Co-operation with industry, non-profit sector and policy-responsible institutions
- Globalisation in writing and research, including development of academic writing standards and modern tradition of academic writing, adopting and adapting of English as a lingua franca in academic writing, through, amongst other interventions, academic writing laboratories

### Desired outcomes – what success would look like

- Better understanding of academic and scholarly career
- Raising research competitiveness
- Assuring scholarly development and continuity in academia
- Developing comprehensive educational models compatible with EU standards
- Enabling academic writing literacy
- Comprehensive educational and research models, locally enacted as part of a Euro-global academic environment

### Developed by

Albena Vatsova, Sophia University, Bulgaria  
Ingrida Vaňková, Prešov University, Slovakia  
Alena Kačmárová, Prešov University, Slovakia

## **MODEL 5 - INTEGRATED CONTINUING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT (AKA 'FEASIBLE UTOPIA' AFTER BARNETT)**

### **Purpose of model**

The purpose of the model is to provide staff in Higher Education across Europe, at each and all stages in their career, with Continuing Professional Development (CPD), in order to counteract what is significantly perceived as the competing demands and the fragmented nature of academic work, irrespective of geographical and disciplinary backgrounds.

### **Summary of model**

The model tries to capture the needs and values voiced by key informants and elicited through the focus groups and the survey conducted as part of COST Action 15221. It therefore builds on three keywords: context, community, character (professional personality/attitude) which summarise the key findings captured in the 3Cs Professional Learning Framework. The model, however, is to be understood as a situated process, allowing for each institution to make the necessary adjustments depending on the local context and the different national policies.

### **Underlying values of the model**

- Adaptability to local context
- Flexibility
- Inclusivity
- Compatibility with organisation rewards system - Equality
- Diversity, including linguistic diversity

### **Characteristics of the model**

The model is

- flexible (allowing for different career tracks, addressing shifts in student populations, adaptable to shifts in society such as IT)
- context-sensitive (in terms of support units/centres and the extent of its centralised nature)
- trajectory-based (it supports all career stages, including pre-career and senior staff)
- cross-disciplinary and at the same time rooted in the disciplines
- compatible with organisations' rewards system
- holistic in approach (it looks holistically at writing and research, teaching and learning)
- encouraging of networking and mobility.

### **Placement of the model in the organisation, including model sponsors, home department/centre/unit, associated senior leaders**

Because this will depend on the individual local context, no specific solution is suggested here. Regardless of its placement, the proposed model will have to promote opportunities for staff to share, to connect and to collaborate across writing and research, teaching and learning.

### **Connectedness within the institution, including interoperability with other centres/units, shared territory, common ground, connection with strategy/policy**

The model of support envisaged will be compatible with the organisation's rewards system. It might decide to outsource the support that it cannot offer in-house by encouraging staff mobility.

## Sample content areas/topics/approaches/formats/processes

The model is context-sensitive, i.e. reflective of the institution/organisation mission: a research university may guarantee support of research and writing, while an institution whose aim is teaching before research may start by supporting learning and teaching. The model speaks to the disciplines, while at the same time tapping into values that cut across the disciplines (e.g. freedom, openness, collegiality, ethics, mobility). It will try to reinforce the individual personality traits that are considered central by key informants irrespective of the disciplinary background, while providing the kind of support that is required by each disciplinary area and that can vary greatly from one discipline to another. It will commit to the needs of the disciplines. The disciplinary-based component will be connected to the overall strategic mission of the institution.

It will adjust its formats and approaches as needs be. Being understood as a process, the model is rather a recommendation general enough to encourage self-reflection (for example, through portfolios), while the approaches/formats will be informed by more surveys, focus groups and interviews of staff (at individual and group level) and adjusted accordingly, as support is being implemented.

The model will mix a top-down and bottom-up approach. It will be top-down to the extent that provision will be offered by the institution, and bottom-up in that it will ask staff what they need, through focus groups with mixed participants.

### Possible content areas/topics might include

- Team-skills
- Leadership skills
- Linguistic diversity
- Writing in the disciplines

### Desired outcomes – what success would look like

- Career progress of staff, across all groups
- Integrated CPD at individual and group levels (e.g. as a disciplinary group)

### Developed by

Geneviève Bordet, Université Paris Diderot, France  
Stacey Cozart, Aarhus University, Denmark  
Sonia Oliver Del Olmo, Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain  
Olga Dontcheva-Navratilova, Masaryk University, Czech Republic  
Maria Freddi, University of Pavia, Italy  
Svetlana Hanusova, Masaryk University, Czech Republic  
Nadja Sennewald, College of Popular Arts (SRH Hochschule der populären Künste), Germany  
Jolanta Sinkuniene, Vilnius University, Lithuania  
Maria Zaleska, University of Warsaw, Poland

Acknowledgement: This framework and the models are based upon collaborative work by COST Action 15221 [members](#), supported by COST (European Cooperation in Science and Technology).

April 2020

