



Editorial

Welcome to our spring issue, which we open with a series of case studies. The first comes from the University of Glasgow, where Kushwah's work, within the context of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), considers the highly beneficial aspects of group work to student learning and skills development in the face of challenges to its effective implementation. The paper reports on a method of "scaffolded group assessment" as a "pathway for developing ESD competencies", which stresses the link between individual success and teamwork. The following three case studies also explore student learning and collaborative working, but with an emphasis on the "pedagogically-grounded uses" (Zarb & Pirie) of AI tools. Two case studies led by Zarb provide food for thought in the use of AI. In the first of these, Zarb and Pirie, the Robert Gordon University, discuss the place of AI-generated 'shadow podcasts', where lecture transcripts become short audio summaries, as a supplementary learning tool. The podcasts are described as a "flexible, scalable and engaging complement to existing resources", which were well received by students whose feedback provided suggestions for greater integration and development. In the second paper led by Zarb, working with Goodfellow, from the University of Strathclyde, challenges of using AI tools in the curriculum are discussed in the context of the computing curricula. The development and use of the ANCOR framework, demonstrates " curriculum-wide approaches ... for embedding ethical and responsible use of Generative AI tools... addressing anthropomorphism, and using illustrative real-world cases". Real-world problem solving is one of the central aspects of the focus of our next case study, from Lee and Salje, Southampton Solent University, whose intriguing paper explores use of the Anomatage table tool in an innovative example of blended learning, integrating criminology and nursing curricula. This example of technological innovation in teaching outlines students' engagement with a digitised cadaver, allowing for an enhanced student experience and learning opportunities. (Readers should be aware that this paper contains images of a digitised cadaver showing body wounds). Our final case study, from Little and colleagues at Manchester Met University, moves into a completely different set of challenges, considering the experience of professional services staff seeking Advance HE professional recognition. This longitudinal case study demonstrates the "dramatic" success at Manchester Met in meeting and addressing these challenges and shares their approach with a view to its transference to other institutions.

Original research also features strongly in this issue and we open this section with an example of digital education from Rose and colleagues from Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, whose work considers the "dual challenge of fostering both pedagogical and digital competences", this time through the medium of video-based peer feedback. Working in the context of physical education teachers, this approach provided a "scalable and meaningful way to integrate digital media" into the curriculum, whilst also meeting demands for "digitally competent educators". Our next example highlights collaborative practice between students based at the University of Glasgow in Scotland and at the University Niccolò Cusano, Italy. Colleagues used the COIL approach - Collaborative Online International Learning - to create meaningful connections between both groups of students in the online environment. Drawing on the results of a longitudinal study,

Breslin and colleagues “identified three interrelated dimensions [of] digital empathy, digital connectivity, and digital presence” and their centrality to sustaining internationalisation in higher education. Two further examples of the student experience are provided in the work of McFeeters, Ulster University, and of Beesley and colleagues, Leeds Beckett University. Using an action research approach, McFeeters examines the experience of students and placement agencies in community youth work, through their perceptions and experience of assessment, surfacing a “strong consensus on the value of reflective assessment and practice-based learning”, and garnering feedback from both groups that contributed to the model offered here of “collaborative, critically engaged assessment”. Beesley’s cross-disciplinary study also examined the experience of professional practice placements, this time through the lens of reasonable adjustments. The paper discusses the ‘othering’ of students in practice placements and recommends the review of placements allied with greater transparency, in order to “align learning opportunities” for all students in order to support their learning and development. Another paper from Leeds Beckett focuses on research-teaching linkages (RTL). Smith and colleagues’ phenomenological study examines the conceptions of, and approaches to, strengthening RTL, highlighting an inextricable link between teacher development in RTL and student learning. This discussion is complemented by another phenomenological study from the James Hutton Institute. Beattie’s work focuses on extending the traditional conception of RTL with the addition of a “third, integrative pillar of scholarship” - public engagement - and its “transformative potential” for learning.

This issue also offers three reflective analyses, focusing on curricula and experiential learning: near-peer led simulation (NPLS), Universal Design for Learning (UDL), and third space professionalism. The context for Harvey and Crighton’s NPLS study, Wrexham University, is pre-registration nursing programmes, where the concepts of performativity and neoliberalism as “out there/in here” are utilised. Mir, Apex College, meanwhile, considers UDL within the setting of private higher education institutions, connecting “lived professional experiences with wider institutional change”. Ball, University of Warwick, reflects on a longitudinal digital teacher education project and the “complexities faced by the project lead”. The paper “underscores the varied nature of leadership in complex educational projects”, situating the experience of leadership within the wider setting of third space professionalism.

We end with two opinion pieces, the first from Bakogiannis, University of Salford and Papavasiliou, University of Leeds, discusses an approach to inclusive practice within the context of English for Academic Purposes which can be procedural as opposed to experiential, and stresses the importance of emotionality and relationality as interdependent dimensions that are often overlooked in the successful implementation of inclusive teaching. Robertson, City of Glasgow College, meanwhile, argues the case for “greater alignment and recognition of learning and teaching qualifications” across both the higher and further education sectors as we move towards a tertiary model of post-compulsory education.

We hope you enjoy the wide variety of papers within this spring issue. We have lots to look forward to over the year, including our first multi-part issue for our European First Year Experience (EFYE) special issue, due out in late May, and we continue to welcome papers and book reviews throughout the year. As always, thanks to our authors for their interesting and scholarly contributions and to our reviewers for their detailed work, all of which comes together to make each issue.

Lorraine Anderson and the JPAAP Editorial Team