

SRHE

*Society for Research
into Higher Education*

**Developing Compassionate Pedagogical
Practice with Students as Co-
Researchers**

Final Research Report

December 2022

Authors

Kathryn Waddington & Bryan Bonaparte

**UNIVERSITY OF
WESTMINSTER **

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Executive summary	4
Main report	5
Background and context	5
Conceptual and theoretical frameworks	6
Critical pedagogy	6
Critical compassion	7
Study crafting	7
Self-compassion	8
Research design and methodology	8
Recruitment of student co-researchers	9
The Thinking Environment	10
Being equal thinking partners	11
Data collection	11
Workshops	11
Reflection	13
Conclusion	15
Appendices	16
Appendix A: Example of student response to invitation to participate	16
Appendix B: Co-investigator reflections	17
Appendix C: Resources for the Thinking Environment and reflection	18
Appendix D: Workshops	20
References	21

Disclaimer: The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Society for Research into Higher Education

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the student co-researchers involved in the project (names withheld to maintain confidentiality), and members of the research steering group:

Alan Porter: Associate Head of School of Social Sciences (Chair)

Haiko Ballieux: Co-investigator

Student Co-researcher Representative

Andy Pitchford: Head of Centre of Education & Teaching Innovation (Internal Advisor)

Jenni Nowlan: Senior Lecturer Westminster Business School (Internal Advisor)

Cathy Bovill: University of Edinburgh (SRHE Critical Friend to the Project)

Keith Magee: UCL & University of Newcastle (External Advisor)

We would also like to thank the SRHE for their understanding and flexibility with delays to data gathering and completion of the project caused by the pandemic.

Executive summary

This research was a small-scale qualitative study undertaken by a research team comprising seven undergraduate psychology students and three academics working together as co-researchers and co-creators of knowledge. The rationale for the study was in support of the ‘compassion turn’ in higher education (HE), which has arisen in response to the damaging effects to students and staff of neoliberal HE policy. The overarching research questions addressed were: (i) what are the core components of compassionate pedagogy at individual (teacher), module, course and institutional levels of analysis? and (ii) to what extent does working with students as co-researchers enhance the quality, relevance and application of compassionate pedagogical research?

The report sets out a conceptual and theoretical framework grounded in critical pedagogy, critical compassion, study crafting, and self-compassion. Study crafting involves enabling students to: (a) increase structural and social study resources; (b) increase challenging study demands/goals; and (c) decrease unhelpful study demands. The research design and methodology used arts-based workshops, and Nancy Kline’s Thinking Environment, in order to develop student-led resources and tools to promote compassionate pedagogical practice. It advances a relational approach to working with students as co-researchers based on the premise of working together as equal thinking partners. This involves courage and vulnerability; by working as co-researchers *and* teachers enabled us to role model ways of practicing compassion in the classroom.

We advance a definition of compassionate pedagogy arising from the research that challenges the discourse of suffering, offering a more critical, intersectional perspective: *Recognising and noticing the difference, discrimination, and bias in how people are being treated, how students are learning and being taught, and the compassionate actions – both strategic and small – that we all need to take to promote and support student and staff wellbeing.* We also reflect on how disruption and delays to the research caused by the pandemic led to an appreciation of ‘slow scholarship’ and the importance of ‘Ease’ as a core component of a Thinking Environment, as illustrated in a student co-researcher’s reflection: *The workshop atmosphere (everyone respecting each other’s turn to speak, no sense of rush, etc.) made it feel like a relaxing space where I could share my thoughts and ideas on something safely.*

This report should be read as a ‘work in progress’ rather than a definitive document, as the research has laid the foundations for: (i) further data gathering; (ii) a co-created shared fictional story based on the Japanese art form of ‘renga’; and (iii) the forthcoming edited collection: *Developing and supporting pedagogies of compassion in higher education: A practice first approach* (Waddington et al., forthcoming).

Main report

Background and context

The original thinking behind the project was the ‘compassion turn’ underway in higher education (HE), driven by a need for a pedagogical paradigm shift (Dickson & Summerville, 2018; Waddington, 2018). Compassion literally means to ‘suffer with’ and encompasses attentiveness, noticing another’s need, and a willingness to alleviate the suffering of others to enhance their wellbeing (Worline & Dutton, 2017). The rise of the neoliberal, marketized and measured university has changed (and continues to change) the nature of academic work, highlighting the need to safeguard time to think and critically reflect (Caddell & Wilder, 2018; Jones, 2022). Compassion is now a core concern in HE and should be at the centre of the university mission (Gibbs, 2017). Compassion has been one of our university’s strategic values since 2018, defined as:

Being thoughtful and sensitive, supportive and encouraging, making time to talk, especially when the pressure is on. We are inclusive, united, careful to consider what enables each and every one of us to play our part. (University of Westminster; *Being Westminster 2022-2029*)

The overarching research questions were:

1. What are the core components of compassionate pedagogy at individual (teacher), module, course and institutional levels of analysis?
2. To what extent does working with students as co-researchers enhance the quality, relevance and application of compassionate pedagogical research?

The COVID-19 pandemic inevitably influenced – and slowed down – the progress of the project and intended outcomes in the original proposal. It also triggered a change in the original methodological approach, which had proposed a focused ethnography, short-term fieldwork, and intensive methods of data collection.

Rationale for change

During the pandemic the university conducted an internal staff survey into wellbeing and COVID-19:

When asked about the one thing that the university could do to help colleagues manage stress and distress from the pandemic, it was acknowledged that the university had done a lot already but could turn its focus to: more realistic and fair workloads; ongoing (even permanent) flexible working arrangements.

Therefore to mitigate against the potential risk of increasing workloads and stress when staff and students were adjusting to online teaching and learning, a more flexible approach was adopted. Importantly, Knight et al.'s (2023) research into the impact of lockdown revealed that employees with high workload, or close monitoring, were more likely to face rising distress. In universities, employee wellbeing is closely aligned with student wellbeing, as Brewster et al. (2022) argue:

It is important that higher education institutions acknowledge and respond proactively to both staff and student wellbeing issues. To do so, institutions should seek to foster a *sustainable and effective academic environment with a whole university approach*. (p. 557, emphasis added)

Adopting a sustainable and less intensive approach was unexpectedly beneficial. The frustrations and re-negotiated deadlines paradoxically allowed 'time to think' and reflect on the merits of 'slow scholarship', which requires care and compassion towards each other (Mountz et al., 2015). There are future publications arising from the research, written as chapters in the edited collection: *Developing and supporting pedagogies of compassion in higher education: A practice first approach* (Waddington et al., forthcoming). SRHE funding will be acknowledged, and this report should be read as 'work in progress', rather than a definitive document.

Conceptual and theoretical frameworks

The project was framed by conceptual and theoretical principles drawn from: (i) critical pedagogy; (ii) critical compassion; (iii) study crafting; and (iv) self-compassion.

Critical pedagogy

The purpose of critical pedagogy is to give students the tools to 'undo, rethink and challenge their received wisdoms about what constitutes knowledge and education (Smith & Seal 2021, p. 1), based on inter-related principles, aims and approaches:

Principles

- Education is inherently political
- Knowledge should relate to, and develop from, the lived experience of participants
- Knowledge should be co-created between all participants in the learning process

Aims

- To develop critical thinkers who create new knowledge
- For people to become aware of their, and others, oppressions and develop the will to act

- For people to make connections between personal experiences and wider societal forces

Approaches

- Emphasising the importance of democracy and equality in learning environments
- Emphasising a co-created flexible curriculum using authentic materials, generative themes, and teachable moments
- Cultivating hope and symbolic resistance

Critical compassion

Critical compassion draws attention to some of the potentially problematic aspects of compassion, which involves moving 'beyond private compassion or sympathy' (Singleton & Mee 2017, p. 141) towards a politics of compassion that promotes an understanding of structural conditions of inequality and injustice. Critical compassionate pedagogy (Hao, 2011) embodies a commitment to open critique of institutionalised policies and practices, engagement in self-reflexivity, and locates compassion as a means of reshaping HE, our communities, our students, and ourselves. This can be amplified by Frost et al.'s (2006) 'critical lenses of compassion' model which comprises:

Compassion as narrative – carried in language and stories that reflect multiple voices and perspectives revealing diversity and difference.

Compassion as interpersonal work – an everyday interaction that requires skill and competence that involves expenditure of cognitive and emotional energy.

Compassion at the organisational level – which occurs when individual behaviours are valued, and systems are in place to enable diffusion of compassion across all levels.

The research applies and develops this theoretical model through a new lens of:

Compassion as seen through students' eyes – which links with the narrative and interpersonal components of compassion.

Study crafting

The concept of study crafting (Körner et al., 2021) is based on job crafting and job demand-resources (JD-R) theory, which are grounded in applied work and organisational psychology. Study crafting involves proactive changes that students can make in 're-balancing' their:

Study demands – which refers to psychological, physical, social, or organisational aspects of learning that require effort and are associated with psychological or physiological costs; and

Study resources – which refers to psychological, physical, social, or organisational support for learning that contribute to goal achievement, reduce study demands, or enhance personal development.

In practice, study crafting involves: (a) increasing structural and social study resources; (b) increasing challenging study demands/goals; and (c) decreasing unhelpful study demands. Participation in the project as co-researchers and part of a research team provided structural and social support and represented a challenging goal for students. Principles and skills of self-compassion (Neff, n.d.) were also introduced as a study resource, as a way of reducing unrealistic demands that students may place upon themselves.

Self-compassion

Self-compassion is treating oneself in the same way you would a loved one/close friend, and extending compassion to yourself with an emphasis on three elements of practice:

1. *Kindness* – as opposed to self-judgement
2. *Shared/common humanity* – as opposed to isolation
3. *Mindfulness* – negative emotions are neither denied, nor exaggerated (Neff, n.d.).

Research by Egan et al. (2022) showed strong, clear associations between enhanced academic performance and self-compassion. Furthermore, there is an increasing drive within HE to ensure that undergraduate courses produce graduates with good work and employability skills, and who contribute to society. Skills of study crafting and self-compassion are transferrable to the workplace for all students, and for psychology students represent evidence of psychological literacy (Hulme & Cranney, 2023). Enabling students to intentionally and adaptively use psychological knowledge, skills, and research to achieve personal, professional and societal goals was a key aspect of the study.

Research design and methodology

This was a small-scale qualitative study which adopted a *relational* approach to working with students as co-researchers and co-creators (Bovill, 2020). A flexible approach was necessary because of university ethical restrictions on carrying out face-to-face research/data collection in response to the pandemic. The pandemic also created additional pressures and uncertainties for students and staff across the HE sector more widely. This necessitated a revision to the initial proposal for a focused ethnography, short-term fieldwork, and intensive methods of data collection. The revised focus of the study was exploration of the research sub-question: *What does compassionate learning and teaching look like when viewed through students' eyes?*

Recruitment of student co-researchers

Bryan Bonaparte and Haiko Ballieux (co-investigators) invited students from their personal tutor groups to participate in the project via email: *If you are interested, please drop me an email with a short (3 or 4 sentences) statement saying why you would like to take part in the study.* An example of one student's response can be found in Appendix A, which concluded:

I am kindly requesting to be a part of your research in the hope that my lived experiences can support you in the vision of fusing compassion to pedagogy as a tool to help every student in their journey to self-actualisation.

Criteria guiding recruitment of student co-researchers were that:

- we had established professional working relationships with them; and
- we were confident that with briefing and support they would be able to work as part of a research team.

These were important aspects of the relational approach to building trust when working with students as co-researchers and co-creators. Seven students from all UG courses (BSc Psychology; BSc Psychology and Counselling; BSc Psychology and Criminology; BSc Cognitive and Clinical Neuroscience) were recruited: Level 4 (n=2); Level 5 (n=3); Level 6 (n=2). It was important to establish a sense of belonging as part of a research team from the outset, for example by sharing lunch/refreshments together at the end of workshops.

Haiko Ballieux has reflected further on how we created a sense of belonging and rapport (see Appendix B), and how this was established from the first meeting:

From the first meeting, staff were very explicit in conveying to students that we intended to create a (safe) space in which they could be free in their expression. We explained that we would see them as equal partners and would highly value their input and feedback, whether positive or constructive/negative.... I personally also took a humble "I don't know" stance and conveyed this to students, so that they felt we also didn't have all the answers.

The study received approval by the university research ethics committee (ETH2122-0454). Care was taken to ensure that participation did not have an adverse impact upon students' studies and coursework deadlines/exams. Participation was voluntary, and students could withdraw from the project at any point (none withdrew). We were also alert to any tensions that could arise between holding both teacher/personal tutor and academic co-researcher roles with students. A member of the student support team (who

was external to the project) also offered confidential pastoral care and an impartial ‘listening ear’ if any students experienced difficulty/discomfort in ‘speaking truth to power’. As this was a confidential offer, we are unable to say if any students took up their offer. However, working with the components of a Thinking Environment (Kline, 2015) and the principle of being equal thinking partners in the project helped address these important issues of boundaries and relationships.

The Thinking Environment

The Thinking Environment was originally developed by Nancy Kline in response to the question: *If action is only as good as the thinking behind it, how do we create the conditions for the highest quality thinking?* What emerged were ten components of a Thinking Environment (Table 1).

Component	Attributes
Attention	Listening without interruption and with interest
Equality	Regarding each other as thinking peers, giving equal time to think
Ease	Discarding internal urgency
Appreciation	Noticing what is good and saying it
Encouragement	Giving courage to go to the unexplored edge of thinking,
Feelings	Welcoming the release of emotion and unexpressed feelings
Information	Full and accurate information and relevant facts
Difference	Prioritising diversity of group identities and understanding their lived experience
Incisive questions™	Uncovering untrue limiting assumptions
Place	A physical environment that says ‘you matter’

Table 1: Components of a Thinking Environment Source: Kline (n.d.)

Strenberg and Dawe (2018) used the Thinking Environment in the research design of an institution-wide study into engagement and wellbeing with students as partners at Ravensbourne University London. While the study reported here was smaller in scale, the Thinking Environment approach was adopted because it allowed us to work together and think together, with a particular focus on: *attention; ease; appreciation; difference; and equality*. This opened up an approach where we became equal thinking partners as well as co-researchers and co-creators.

Being equal thinking partners

Being equal thinking partners in co-researcher relationships does not assume that the 'equal' element implies that each party is equal in their knowledge; nor does it assume that everyone thinks the same. Quite the opposite. Being equal thinking partners is about mutual respect for difference and diversity of experience, thinking and opinion (see Magee, 2022). This facilitates an environment of psychological safety where everyone can say what is on their mind without fear of judgement or reprisal. During the introductory workshop students were given resources outlining key components and approaches to working with the Thinking Environment, including 'thinking rounds', 'thinking in pairs', and resources for reflective practice. This formed part of the study crafting and job demands-resources approach adopted (see above, and Appendix C).

Data collection

Data collection used creative arts-based approaches (James & Brookfield, 2014; Leavy, 2020), with four face-to-face workshops during non-teaching weeks, and outside of the university examination periods. Workshops took place between March to July 2022, and a *SRHE Research Team* group on Microsoft Teams was created to give everyone a sense of identity and belonging as part of a team. This was also a useful platform to share information about workshops, resources, thoughts, reflections, and emotions. For example on 8th Sept 2022 one student co-researcher wrote:

The recent news events were kind of shocking. We are now going into a time of definitive change in so many ways. Start of a new academic year, personal life permanent changes, change of prime minister just yesterday and now the Queen dies. wow.

Workshops

The aim of the workshops was to use arts-based methods to facilitate critical thinking and reflection on experiences and stories of compassion (see Appendix D). Working together creatively was guided by an overarching set of principles for thinking rounds:

- *Everyone matters* – give everyone a turn to speak; go around the group systematically at the beginning of the workshop, on each item or topic and at the end
- *Don't interrupt or be interrupted* – this enables everyone to think for themselves; allow each person to finish their thoughts
- *Explore ideas and insights in depth* – this can liberate the thinking of the group

All workshops began with a thinking round, where everyone brought an item/artefact that represented compassion, creativity, or playfulness. Guidance was deliberately vague to

avoid preconceptions, assumptions, bias, and stereotypes; for example: *Please bring something that represents compassion to you; the only restriction/condition is that it should be portable and safe.* Items/artefacts shared included poetry, personal items (e.g. a necklace given by a friend after lockdown, a book that had belonged to a student's grandmother), and the image of a duck on water surrounded by 'ripples of compassion' (see Figure 1).



Figure 1: Ripples of Compassion

Photograph taken by Frands Pedersen, reproduced with permission

Figure 1 illustrates how compassion keeps us afloat while paddling frantically below the surface, creating small ripples that collectively will grow into a Tsunami of positive change. It was originally used by Frands Pedersen as a reflection on his chapter: 'Compassion: An antidote to neoliberal higher education policies in England' (Pedersen, 2021). The imagery of ripples also featured in the workshop which used movies (e.g. the short film *Compassion in Action*) as a method for reflecting on the differences between sympathy, empathy and compassion.

Bringing in something from our lives, experiences, and thinking to the workshops helped to create a sense of being equal thinking partners, and also a shared vulnerability, which is a strength. As Brown (2017) asserts, vulnerability is about the willingness and courage to show up and be seen when the outcome may be uncertain. Therefore in the workshops, as both co-researchers *and* teachers, we were role modelling *compassion in the classroom*, and demonstrating:

The courage to teach with compassion [which] means working courageously toward the transformation of systemic sources of suffering as well as developing

skilled relational practices to interact with compassion toward colleagues and students. (Worline & Dutton, 2022, p. 34)

Reflection

Returning to the initial research questions:

1. What are the core components of compassionate pedagogy at individual (teacher), module, course and institutional levels of analysis?
2. To what extent does working with students as co-researchers enhance the quality, relevance and application of compassionate pedagogical research?

To recap, the change in methodological approach led to a more detailed exploration of the research sub-question:

3. *What does compassionate learning and teaching look like when viewed through students' eyes?*

There are three short answers to the above questions. *Firstly*, compassionate pedagogy is not something that can be commodified; nor is it something that can be 'bolted on' or used as a checklist and pasted over existing modules/courses (see Rawle, 2021). It requires a *whole university approach, built upon compassionate organisational cultures and communities*, as illustrated in Brewster et al.'s (2023) large scale qualitative study:

Culture is defined here as the shared assumptions, values, and patterns of behaviour that underpin expectations about how work is conducted in a given setting, encapsulating workload and work-life balance ... policies and interventions alone, without cultural change, were inadequate to support better student and staff wellbeing. Workplace cultural change was viewed as instrumental to wellbeing, and requiring long-term, holistic, and institutional action. (p.554)

Secondly, compassionate pedagogy is everybody's business, and HE business models and systems will need to change to allow ripples of compassion to spread (Waddington & Bonaparte, forthcoming). *Thirdly*, seeing compassion through students' eyes is crucial in order to highlight previously hidden aspects of students' experiences and emotions. This is encapsulated in the following student co-researcher's reflection:

Although I was very nervous during the first meeting, the workshop atmosphere (everyone respecting each other's turn to speak, no sense of rush, etc.) made it feel like a relaxing space where I could share my thoughts and ideas on something safely, without feeling like a specific answer was expected of me – something that I have sometimes found to be lacking in the classroom.

Working with students as co-researchers, it was important to use a working definition that combined theoretical concepts, critical thinking, and day-to-day lived learning experiences and language. Initially, we defined compassionate pedagogy as being about:

Ensuring that our teaching and interactions with students and colleagues are based on kindness and are followed through by actions and practices that alleviate suffering and promote wellbeing.

However, an awareness of the impact of wider oppressions, intersections, and the need for new ways of working, led us to re-define compassionate pedagogy as:

Recognising and noticing the difference, discrimination, and bias in how people are being treated, how students are learning and being taught, and the compassionate actions – both strategic and small – that we all need to take to promote and support student and staff wellbeing.

The research has generated resources for critical reflection that will be developed and disseminated internally through the university's Centre for Education and Teaching Innovation (CETI). The COVID-19 pandemic had an impact on the progress and outcomes of this research, resulting in reflections on the benefits of slow scholarship (Mountz et al., 2015), and significance of the Thinking Environment component Ease:

An internal state free from rush or urgency, creates the best conditions for thinking. But Ease, particularly in organisations and through the 'push' aspect of social networking, is being systematically bred out of our lives. If we want people to think well under impossible deadlines and inside the injunctions of 'faster, better, cheaper, more,' we must cultivate internal ease. (Kline, n.d., p.4)

Conclusion

The conclusion does not represent the end of this collaboration with students as co-creators, and although the funded part of the study has been completed there is still work to be done. This includes further data and material from: (i) a focus group interview; and (ii) an ongoing co-created story based inspired by the Japanese art of 'renga' (Gabriel & Connell, 2010). A Japanese renga is a poem consisting of several stanzas, each composed by a different poet. Co-creation of a *prose version* of a renga results in a fictional text that is jointly created and jointly owned, but which offers licence to address potentially embarrassing, dangerous, or taboo topics such as barriers to compassion. Some of the student co-researchers have used their own poetry, art and drawing in their reflective journals, and we plan to incorporate these into the story – but work like this needs time to think and Ease!

More broadly, advances in theory and models of compassionate pedagogy, alongside changes and in HE after the COVID-19 pandemic present educators and researchers with challenges in seeking to stay abreast of their fields and navigate new scholarly terrains. Many fields of inquiry and disciplines are beginning to question the relevance of research findings and theorising from studies conducted pre-pandemic, and the value of last century's methodologies for addressing 21st century challenges (Waddington et al., forthcoming). This research has illustrated innovative use of arts-based methods and the Thinking Environment as a methodological approach that can meet these challenges. Working with students as equal thinking partners can extend into other forms of pedagogical partnership, for example with students as co-creators of curriculum, assessment, and knowledge (Bovill, 2020; Cook-Sather & Matthews, 2021). Being equal thinking partners promotes shared responsibility and ownership, creating new forms of student-teacher agency, and more democratic, inclusive, and dynamic ways of working and learning with, from, and about, each other and ourselves:

As such – other than receiving a lifelong lesson on what it means to be compassionate towards myself and others – I believe that the research into Compassion in Pedagogy is essential not only because it can raise the standards of education making it a further equitable space for learners but also because it can be a holistic way of teaching that can nurture not only the 'student' aspect of individuals but also the 'person as whole.' (Student Co-researcher)

Appendices

Appendix A: Example of student response to invitation to participate

Dear research team

I would like to participate in the study because I passionately support the idea of the educational system adopting a more conscious approach in a process to transform its hubs into spaces where every student can be holistically supported in achieving their full potential.

Having worked as a Nursery Nurse assistant I understand the importance of compassionate pedagogy, and empathy was my first line of defence especially when addressing children with behavioural/educational difficulties.

Now as a student myself I have the opportunity to observe and analyse how the level of involvement by teaching staff influences my academic experience and how my academic experience stirs my aspiration for the future.

Therefore, I am kindly requesting to be a part of your research in the hope that my lived experiences can support you in the vision of fusing compassion to pedagogy as a tool to help every student in their journey to self-actualisation.

Thank you.

Appendix B: Co-investigator reflections

From the first meeting, staff were very explicit in conveying to students that we intended to create a (safe) space in which they could be free in their expression. We explained that we would see them as equal partners and would highly value their input and feedback, whether positive or constructive/negative. I feel it took about 2 meetings to build up this (possibly new) kind of rapport with them, and for them to really start opening up. I think this happened because staff consistently encouraged them to not only passively participate, but actively co-create, come up with their own ideas, and give us feedback on their own lived experiences of being a student at UoW. I personally also took a humble "I don't know" stance and conveyed this to students, so that they felt we also didn't have all the answers. I further think this rapport was really enhanced through the "thinking environment", because it helped create the safe space in which everyone could have their say and, more importantly, knew they would be listened to. It also encouraged those not speaking to listen to understand, rather than listen to respond (or interrupt). This created equality amongst staff and students and helped strengthen rapport between them. Over the course of the first few meetings, I noticed that especially the more quiet/shy students started to feel safe enough to actively give feedback, come up with very creative ideas (e.g. poetry, sketches), and allowed themselves to be seen and heard. For me, this was probably one of the most satisfying elements of this research project, because without the structure we created and the rapport we built, those students might not have opened up, and we therefore would have missed their contributions. Finally, personal tutoring has an element of pastoral care that involves creating rapport between tutor and tutee, so the fact that some staff were personal tutor of some of the students on this project (which was not the case for all of them), might have helped them feel safe enough to open up and give constructive feedback.

Haiko Ballieux

21.02.23

Appendix C: Resources for the Thinking Environment and reflection

THE TEN COMPONENTS OF A THINKING ENVIRONMENT®



<https://www.timetothink.com/thinking-environment/>

Rounds in a Thinking Environment

Everyone matters.

Regardless of power differentials and hierarchical placement, in thinking rounds everyone's thinking matters equally because getting everyone's best thinking produces best results. The best way to get the best thinking from everyone is to populate the meeting with systematic uninterrupted Rounds. Rounds increase the generative nature of the group's thinking. Rounds also usually produce superior ideas in less time. A Round is a simple enough concept, but it requires these four actions from the facilitator/chair:

1. Decide first what the question is that people will be addressing in the Round e.g., *What does being compassionate mean to you? What interpersonal skills and behaviours are needed when you are being compassionate?*
2. Determine the direction of the Round (clockwise, anti-clockwise)
3. Ask for a volunteer to begin the Round
4. Remind people that no one speaks again until the Round is completed

Thinking in pairs

The quality of everything we do depends on the quality of the thinking we do first

In pairs:

First ask: What would you like to think about and what are your thoughts?

Then ask: What more do you think, or feel, or want to say?

Conclude with: What I have appreciated from listening is your

Keeping a reflective journal

The resources here are intended to guide your reflective writing and learning. There are many approaches, and you are encouraged to experiment and find out what works best for you. It is sometimes easier to start with a more structured approach, as well as keeping a journal and using creative methods:

Gibbs' Reflective Learning Cycle

<https://learningperformance.com/gibbs-reflective-cycle-and-learning/>

Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle

<https://learningperformance.com/gibbs-reflective-cycle-and-learning/>

Keeping a self-compassion journal

<https://self-compassion.org/exercise-6-self-compassion-journal/>

Using creative methods to reflect

<https://www.nicole-brown.co.uk/creative-reflections/>

What you write in your reflective journal is private, but we will share our experiences, insights, learning, and recommendations for the development of compassionate pedagogical practice in reflective workshops.

Appendix D: Workshops

All photographs reproduced with permission



Student co-researchers engaging with creative materials



Artefacts were used as reflective tools/metaphors – e.g. the gyroscopic Powerball® (bottom R) which strengthens arm muscles for better power, endurance and grip – sparked thinking around strategies for building self-compassion and resilience. *Play-Doh*® creation (top R) sparked thinking and dialogue around barriers to compassion, and how to overcome them.

References

- Bovill, C. (2020). *Co-creating learning and teaching: Towards relational pedagogy in higher education*. Critical Publishing Ltd.
- Brewster, L., Jones, E., Priestly, M., Wilbraham, S. J., Spanner, L., & Hughes, G. (2022). 'Look after the staff and they would look after the students' cultures of wellbeing and mental health in the university setting. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(4), 548-560.
- Brown, B. (2017). *Rising strong: How the ability to reset transforms the way we live, love, parent, and lead*. Random House.
- Caddell, M., & Wilder, K. (2018). Seeking compassion in the measured university: Generosity, collegiality and competition in academic practice. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 6(3), 14-23.
- Cook-Sather, A., & Matthews, K. E. (2021). Pedagogical partnership: Engaging with students as co-creators of curriculum, assessment and knowledge. In L. Hunt & D. Chalmers (Eds.), *University teaching in focus: A learning-centred approach* (pp. 243-259). Routledge.
- Dickson, L., & Summerville, T. (2018). 'The truth about stories': Coming to compassionate pedagogy in a first-year program. *Journal of Perspectives in Applied Academic Practice*, 6(3), 24-29
- Egan, H., O'Hara, M., Cook A., & Mantzios M. (2022). Mindfulness, self-compassion, resiliency and wellbeing in higher education: A recipe to increase academic performance. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 46(3), 301-311.
- Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Maitlis, S., Lilius, J. M., Kanov, J. M., & Worline, M. (2006). Seeing organizations differently: Three lenses on compassion. In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, T. B. Lawrence & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organization studies* (2nd ed., pp. 844-866). Sage Publications.
- Gabriel, Y., & Connell, N. A. D. (2010). Co-creating stories: Collaborative experiments in storytelling. *Management Learning*, 41(5), 507-523.
- Gibbs, P. (Ed.) (2017). *The pedagogy of compassion at the heart of higher education*. Springer Nature.
- Hao, R. N. (2011). Critical compassionate pedagogy and the teacher's role in first-generation student success. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 125, 91-98.
- Hulme, J. A., & Cranney, J. (2023). Psychological literacy and learning for life. In J. Zumbach, D A. Bernstein, S. Narciss & G. Marsico (Eds.), *International handbook of psychology learning and teaching* (pp. 881-910). Springer Nature.
- James, A., & Brookfield, S. D. (2014). *Engaging imagination: Helping students become creative and reflective thinkers*. Jossey-Bass.
- Jones, S. (2022). *Universities under fire: Hostile discourses and integrity deficits in higher education*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kline, N. (2015). *More time to think: The power of independent thinking*. Cassell.

- Knight, C., Keller, A. C., & Parker, S. J. (2023). Job demands, not resources, predict worsening psychological distress during the early phase of the COVID-19 pandemic. *Work & Stress*, 37(1), 55-77.
- Körner, L. S., Rigotti, T., & Reider, K. (2021). Study crafting and self-undermining in higher education students: A weekly diary study on the antecedents. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18 (7090), 1-19.
- Leavy, P. (2020). *Method meets art: Arts-based research practice* 3rd ed. Guildford Press.
- Mountz, A., Bonds, A., Mansfield, B., Loyd, J., Hyndman, J., Walton-Roberts, M., Basu, R., Whitson, R., Hawkins, R., Hamilton, T., & Curran, W. (2015). For slow scholarship: A feminist politics of resistance through collective action in the neoliberal university. *ACME: An International E-Journal for Critical Geographies*, 14(4), 1235-1259.
- Pedersen, F. (2021). Compassion: An antidote to neoliberal higher education policies in England. In K. Waddington (Ed.), *Towards the compassionate university: from golden thread to global impact* (pp. 136-148). Routledge.
- Singleton, V., & Mee, S. (2017). Critical compassion: Affect, discretion and policy–care relations. *The Sociological Review Monographs*, 65(2), 130-149.
- Smith, A. & Seal, M. (2021). The contested terrain of critical pedagogy and teaching informal education in higher education. *Education Science*, 11(476), 1-16.
- Strenberg, P., & Dawe, F. (2018). *Integrating wellbeing and student engagement: Lessons from the growing creative leaders of the future programme*. The Leadership Foundation for Higher Education.
- Waddington, K. (2018). Understanding and creating compassionate institutional cultures and practices. In P. Gibbs, J. Jameson & A. Elwick (Eds.), *Values of the university in a time of uncertainty* (pp. 241-260). Springer Nature.
- Waddington, K., & Bonaparte, B. (forthcoming). Seeing the bigger picture: Why compassionate pedagogy is everyone's business. *Inaugural CETI Position Paper*. University of Westminster.
- Waddington, K., Bonaparte, B., & Gibbs, P. (Eds.) (forthcoming). *Developing and supporting pedagogies of compassion in higher education: A practice first approach*. Springer Nature.
- Worline, M.C., & Dutton, J. E. (2017). *Awakening compassion at work: The quiet power that elevates people and organizations*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Worline, M.C., & Dutton, J. E. (2022). The courage to teach with compassion: Enriching classroom designs and practices to foster responsiveness to suffering. *Management Learning*, 53(1) 33-54.

Online Sources

Film: *Compassion in Action*. (Paulraj P @ PaulrajTubes, 12th Jan. 2015).

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4bozlrVVok>

Kline, N. (n.d.). *The ten components*.

<https://www.timetothink.com/thinking-environment/the-ten-components/>

Magee, K. (Nov. 2nd 2022). *Why we need to find common ground to save democracy*.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wihbwaFspTM>

Neff, K. (n.d.). *Self-compassion*. <https://self-compassion.org/>

Rawle, F. (20th Aug. 2021). *A pedagogy of kindness: The cornerstone for student learning and wellness*. <https://www.timeshighereducation.com/campus/pedagogy-kindness-cornerstone-student-learning-and-wellness>