Andragoška spoznanja/Studies in Adult Education and Learning, 2020, 26(2), 3-13
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4312/as.26.2.3-13

UVODNIK

SEDANJOST IN PRIHODNOST VISOKOŠOLSKEGA IZOBRAŽEVANJA

Tokratna številka Andragoških spoznanj je nastala kot rezultat projekta *Inovativno učenje in poučevanje v visokem šolstvu (INOVUP)*, ki se izvaja na vseh treh javnih slovenskih univerzah: Univerzi v Ljubljani, Univerzi v Mariboru in Univerzi na Primorskem. Poleg teh treh institucij, ki zajemajo večino slovenskega visokošolskega prostora, v konzorciju sodeluje tudi Fakulteta za informacijske študije v Novem mestu. Osrednji namen projekta INOVUP (www.inovup.si), ki ga financira ministrstvo za izobraževanje, znanost in šport prek sredstev Evropskega socialnega sklada (ESS), je preveriti in »prevetriti« visokošolsko didaktiko na slovenskih univerzah. V projektu ne želimo zgolj analizirati stanja na tem področju, temveč prek različnih usposabljanj spodbuditi refleksijo visokošolskih učiteljev o lastni praksi in jih usposobiti za vpeljavo novih pristopov v poučevanje. Izhodišče projekta je torej v spoznanju, da mora biti visokošolski učitelj ne samo vrhunski znanstvenik na habilitiranem področju, temveč tudi didaktični strokovnjak, ki poleg drugih vidikov svojega dela razvija in spremlja tudi kakovost poučevanja.

Tovrstna prizadevanja projekta INOVUP na področju visokošolskega izobraževanja niso nekaj novega. Lahko bi rekli, da sega interes za raziskovanje značilnosti poučevanja in učenja na visokošolski ravni že vsaj v osemdeseta leta, ki jih označuje monografija *Learning, Cognition, and College Teaching* (McKeachie, 1980). Urednik te publikacije Walter McKeachie (1980) je v njej naštel tri glavna področja, ki so (vsaj z vidika pedagoške psihologije) pomembna za razumevanje poučevanja in učenja v visokem šolstvu in so še vedno aktualna: poznavanje kognitivnih procesov, učnih metod in razlik med študenti. V našem prostoru smo bili na tem področju tudi takrat že v koraku s časom, saj sta se prof. dr. Vlado Schmidt (1972) in prof. ddr. Barica Marentič Požarnik (1978) že v sedemdesetih letih ukvarjala tudi z vprašanji visokošolske didaktike. Razmisleke o kakovosti in rezultatih visokošolskega poučevanja pa lahko odkrijemo tudi že prej, npr. Klapper (1950) je že v petdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja pisal o razhajanjih med postavljenimi učnimi cilji predmeta in dejanskimi dosežki študentov ter pozival k temu, da bi tudi visokošolski učitelji obvezno potrebovali vsaj minimalna znanja s področja poučevanja. Ideje, o katerih na različnih visokošolskih posvetih razpravljamo še danes.

S čim se univerza in visokošolski učitelj soočata danes? Kot poudarja Aoun (2017), vstopamo v 21. stoletje, ki ga spremljata četrta industrijska revolucija in avtomatizacija. Tudi

v izobraževanju se tem spremembam ne moremo izogniti, še najmanj na visokošolski ravni. Aoun meni, da bi morali predvsem v visokošolskem izobraževanju v tem obdobju četrte industrijske revolucije oblikovati izobraževalne modele, ki bi razvijali zlasti tisto znanje in spretnosti, ki bodo v prihodnosti nenadomestljivi z algoritmi ali roboti: kreativnost, kritično mišljenje, nove pismenosti (digitalno in druge), multikulturnost in podjetnost (Aoun, 2017). Glavne značilnosti univerze prihodnosti torej niso toliko povezane s tehnološko infrastrukturo ali celo zaposljivostjo kot z bolj »razsvetljenskimi« cilji univerzitetnega študija.

Ob tem se seveda postavlja vprašanje, kako naj te cilje v visokošolskem izobraževanju dosežemo. Ali so obstoječi načini dovolj dobri ali bi jih bilo treba izboljšati? V projektu INOVUP univerze sledijo spoznanjem pedagoške in psihološke stroke, po katerih je uspešnost študija sicer odvisna od mnogih dejavnikov, eden pomembnejših pa je kakovost pedagoškega dela učiteljev, asistentov, lektorjev in drugih, ki izvajajo pedagoški proces. Kakovost pedagoškega dela je težko definirati, še težje meriti, nedvomno pa je povezana tudi z ustrezno didaktično usposobljenostjo pedagoškega kadra. Sama »inovativnost« učnih metod tukaj ni toliko pomembna kot uporaba ustreznih metod za doseganje določenih učnih ciljev oziroma razvoj v učnem načrtu zapisanih kompetenc. Ali lahko vse dosežemo samo z uporabo ene metode? Težko. Ali je samo zaradi uporabe tako imenovanih inovativnih učnih metod študij kaj bolj kakovosten? Prav tako ne. Izbira učnih metod je preplet različnih učiteljevih odločitev, ki so pogojene s cilji, vsebino, študenti ali okoliščinami, v katerih poteka študij.

Martin, Prosser, Trigwell, Ramsden in Benjamin (2000) menijo, da na različne stile poučevanja ne vpliva toliko učiteljeva strokovnost ali pedagoško (didaktično) znanje, temveč tudi to, kakšno znanje želi študentom posredovati in kako (s katerimi učnimi metodami/oblikami) namerava to doseči. V zgodovini visokošolske didaktike so potekale že številne debate, kateri pristopi so najbolj učinkoviti. Velik del razprav se je vrtel ravno okoli empiričnih dokazov, ki bi potrjevali ali zavrnili učinkovitost učnih metod, usmerjenih na študenta, v primerjavi z učnimi metodami, usmerjenimi na vsebino/učitelja. Čeprav so rezultati v preteklosti kazali različne vplive teh dveh pristopov (npr. Krumboltz in Farquhar, 1957; Webb in Baird, 1968), pa si je danes stroka bolj ali manj enotna o prednosti uporabe visokošolskih učnih metod, ki spodbujajo aktivno udeležbo študentov pri učenju. Opravljene metaanalize v zadnjem obdobju so to stališče večkrat potrdile (Chen in Yang, 2019; Cornelius-White, 2007; Deslauriers, Schelew in Wieman, 2011; Schmidt, van der Molen, te Winkel in Wijnen, 2009).

Glede na to ni presenetljivo, da se poskuša v projektu INOVUP spodbuditi visokošolske učitelje k »inoviranju« lastne pedagoške prakse. Razvijati nove pristope, izboljšati obstoječe, predvsem pa deliti svoje izkušnje s kolegi in s tem spodbuditi razvoj skupnosti, ki bi lahko delovala tudi potem, ko se bo projekt končal. Seveda je jasno, da samo s prenovo izvedbe študijskega procesa ne bo mogoče trajno izboljšati kakovosti študija. To je še posebej pomembno, če imamo v mislih aktivne metode dela s študenti – te običajno potekajo v manjših skupinah, v didaktično dobro opremljenih predavalnicah in z učitelji, ki

imajo dobre pogoje za svoj profesionalni razvoj. Izzivi za razvoj in ohranjanje kakovosti visokošolskega študija bodo torej po končanem projektu INOVUP za univerze celo večji, kot so zdaj.

Tokratna (tematska) številka Andragoških spoznanj prinaša šest zanimivih prispevkov s področja visokošolske didaktike.

Barica Marentič Požarnik v uvodnem prispevku *Visokošolska didaktika in didaktično usposabljanje visokošolskih učiteljev pri nas – dosedanji razvoj, izkušnje in problemi* opisuje spreminjanje pedagoških pristopov v visokošolskem izobraževanju od šestdesetih let do danes. Avtorica ob tem poudarja, da prizadevanje za izboljšanje procesov poučevanja v tem prostoru ni novo, temveč ima že dolgo tradicijo. V prispevku predstavlja glavne oblike, cilje, vsebine in metode ter dosežke didaktičnega usposabljanja visokošolskih učiteljev v različnih obdobjih.

Drugi prispevek z naslovom *Spodbujanje aktivnega študija, kot ga zaznavajo študenti* so pripravile Katja Košir, Tina Vršnik Perše, Sabina Ograjšek in Milena Ivanuš Grmek. V njem raziskujejo pomen koncepta »na študenta usmerjenega poučevanja«, ki temelji na spodbujanju študentove aktivne vloge v procesu lastnega učenja. Avtorice poudarjajo, da je za uspešno spodbujanje tega procesa treba razumeti učni proces študentov. V članku predstavljajo raziskavo, ki se je ukvarjala ravno s tem vprašanjem – zaznavanje visokošolskega pouka z vidika aktivnega osmišljanja študijskih vsebin in vidika povezovanja teoretičnih spoznanj s prakso.

V prispevku *Možnosti za uporabo na študenta osredinjenih metod poučevanja in učenja bioloških predmetov na UP FAMNIT* avtorici Živa Fišer in Alenka Baruca Arbeiter analizirata izvajanje bioloških predmetov z vidika na študenta osredinjenih pristopov učenja in poučevanja, podprtih z orodji informacijsko-komunikacijske tehnologije. Avtorici predstavljata raziskavo, s katero sta želeli odkriti učne metode, ki jih uporabljajo izvajalci praktičnega pouka bioloških predmetov. Rezultati so pokazali, da uporabljeni pristopi anketirancev podpirajo in nadgrajujejo izkustveno učenje, da o univerzalnih pristopih ni mogoče govoriti ter da se visokošolski učitelji avtonomno odločajo o primernih pristopih glede na učno vsebino in postavljene učne cilje.

Concetta Tino se v prispevku *Celostna interpretacija osebnih in spremljevalnih dejavnikov upiranja študentov pri aktivnem učenju in strategijah poučevanja* prav tako ukvarja s pristopi, ki spodbujajo na študenta usmerjeno poučevanje. Kljub dokazanim pozitivnim učinkom teh pristopov pa se – tako opozarja avtorica – študenti na njihovo vpeljavo ne odzovejo vedno pozitivno. Določen delež študentov, poudarja, take pristope vedno zavrača. Razlogi za to so različni in segajo od subjektivnih do objektivnih dejavnikov. V članku avtorica ponuja nekaj praktičnih izhodišč za zmanjševanje odklonilnega odnosa. Kot glavni dejavnik priporoča vzpostavitev celovitega didaktičnega sistema, ki zajema vse dejavnike, ki potencialno vplivajo na negativna stališča študentov do določenih didaktičnih pristopov.

V članku *Profesionalni razvoj in pedagoško usposabljanje visokošolskega učitelja* Maja Mezgec ponuja poglobljen vpogled v modele profesionalnega razvoja visokošolskih učiteljev tako z vidika dejavnikov, ki vplivajo na ta profesionalni razvoj, kot z vidika njegovih faz. Posebno pozornost namenja vplivu usposabljanja ob delu ter pregledu področij kompetentnosti. Avtorica v prvem delu usmerja pozornost na doktorski študij, ki po njenem mnenju pomeni izhodišče kariernega in profesionalnega razvoja visokošolskega učitelja, v nadaljevanju pa se usmeri na dejavnike, ki spodbujajo nadaljnje izobraževanje in usposabljanje visokošolskih učiteljev.

Monika Govekar-Okoliš in Nataša Kermavnar v prispevku *Mentorstvo medicinskih sester in njihovi pogledi na učinkovitost prakse univerzitetnih študentov* predstavljata vidike, ki vplivajo na učinkovitost mentorstva za študente zdravstvene nege v bolnišnicah. Namen študije je bil ugotoviti učinke mentorstva medicinskih sester za študente med njihovo prakso in načine izboljšanja mentorstva v zdravstveni praksi študentov. Izsledki njune raziskave so nakazali na pomanjkljivo pedagoško in andragoško znanje mentorjev ter potrebo po vzpostaviti mednarodne mreže mentorstva medicinskih sester. To bi po njunem mnenju lahko imelo velik vpliv na mednarodno sodelovanje mentorjev medicinskih sester, učinkovitost njihovega mentorstva, boljšo zdravstveno prakso in zaposlovanje študentov.

V članku *Bralno razumevanje strokovnih besedil v tujem jeziku: vloga strokovnega predznanja* avtorica Alenka Umek obravnava vzorce, ki jih uporabljajo študenti ekonomskih in poslovnih ved v procesu bralnega razumevanja strokovnih besedil v tujem jeziku. Avtorica je bralno razumevanje preverjala z metodo glasnega razmišljanja ob branju in ugotovila, da so bralci z boljšim strokovnim predznanjem pogosteje uporabili pravilno parafraziranje, sklepanje, pojasnjevanje in vrednotenje. Bralci s šibkejšim strokovnim predznanjem so pogosteje uporabili lokalni pristop k branju, s tem da so se bolj osredinili na posamezne besede. Pri tem so med rabo slovenskega jezika uporabljali angleške izraze ter nepravilne ali približne parafraze. Avtorica v sklepu študije ponuja tudi nekatere napotke za poučevanje branja v tujem jeziku in razvijanje disciplinarne pismenosti.

V rubriki »Poročila, odmevi, ocene« avtorice Monika Govekar-Okoliš, Katja Jeznik, Nina Breznikar in Klara Skubic Ermenc poročajo o *Pedagoško-andragoških dnevih*, ki so potekali 23. januarja 2020 na Filozofski fakulteti Univerze v Ljubljani. Številka se končuje z recenzijo knjige *Doba velikih migracij na Slovenskem* avtorjev Kalc, Milharčič Hladnik in Žitnik Serafin, ki jo je pripravila Klara Kožar Rosulnik.

Nastanek tokratne številke je zaznamovan tudi z boleznijo COVID-19, posledično samoizolacijo in tako rekoč prisilnim prehodom s klasičnega načina poučevanja na poučevanje in učenje na daljavo. Brutalen socialni in pedagoški eksperiment, ki pa je nedvomno lahko tudi povod za refleksijo naše pedagoške prakse. Uredništvo Andragoških spoznanj upa, da bomo kamenček k tej refleksiji prispevali tudi s to tematsko številko.

Marko Radovan

Financiranje

Prispevek je rezultat raziskovalnega dela, sofinanciranega s strani Republike Slovenije in Evropske unije iz Evropskega socialnega sklada v okviru projekta Inovativno učenje in poučevanje v visokem šolstvu (INOVUP).

LITERATURA

Aoun, J. E. (2017). *Robot-proof: Higher education in the age of artificial intelligence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chen, C.-H. in Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review*, *26*, 71–81.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 113–143.

Deslauriers, L., Schelew, E. in Wieman, C. (2011). Improved Learning in a Large-Enrollment Physics Class. *Science*, *332*(6031), 862–864.

Klapper, P. (1950). Problems in College Teaching. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, *36*(1), 53–63.

Krumboltz, J. D. in Farquhar, W. W. (1957). The effect of three teaching methods on achievement and motivational and outcomes in a how-to-study course. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *71*(14), 1–26.

Marentič Požarnik, B. (1978). *Prispevek k visokošolski didaktiki*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P. in Benjamin, J. (2000). What university teachers teach and how they teach it. *Instructional Science*, *28*(5), 387–412.

McKeachie, W. J. (1980). *Learning, Cognition, and College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schmidt, H. G., van der Molen, H. T., te Winkel, W. W. R. in Wijnen, W. H. F. W. (2009). Constructivist, problem-based learning does work: A meta-analysis of curricular comparisons involving a single medical school. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(4), 227–249.

Schmidt, V. (1972). *Visokošolska didaktika*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Webb, C. in Baird, J. H. (1968). Learning Differences Resulting from Teacher- and Student-Centered Teaching Methods. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *39*(8), 456–460.

Andragoška spoznanja/Studies in Adult Education and Learning, 2020, 26(2), 3-13
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4312/as.26.2.3-13 Editorial

EDITORIAL

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This issue of *Studies in Adult Education and Learning* is a result of the *Innovative Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (INOVUP)* project, which is taking place in all three public universities in Slovenia: the University of Ljubljana, the University of Maribor and the University of Primorska. Along with these three institutions, which represent the majority share of higher education in Slovenia, the project consortium also includes the Faculty of Information Studies in Novo mesto. Financed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport with funds from the European Social Fund, the purpose of INOVUP (www.inovup.si) is to investigate and improve the quality of higher education teaching in Slovenian universities. Our goal is not only to analyse the current state but to use various forms of training to encourage higher education teachers to reflect on their own practices and to equip them with the skills they need to introduce new approaches into their teaching. The impetus for the project is the realisation that a teacher in higher education needs to not only excel in their own specific field but also be a skilful teacher, who along with all other aspects of their work also grows and evolves when it comes to teaching.

INOVUP's efforts are not new in the field of higher education. It is possible to track interest into the qualities of higher education teaching and learning at least to the beginning of the 1980s, to the publication of *Learning, Cognition, and College Teaching* (McKeachie, 1980). Its editor, Walter McKeachie (1980), lists three main areas that are (from the point of view of educational psychology) important for understanding higher education teaching and learning, and which are still relevant today: knowledge of cognitive processes, learning methods, and differences between students. Slovenia, at the time still part of Yugoslavia, was abreast of the times even then: Vlado Schmidt (1972) and Barica Marentič Požarnik (1978) were already addressing issues concerning higher education teaching. Thoughts on the quality and the results of higher education go even further back, for example, to Klapper (1950) in the 1950s. He wrote about the divergence between the learning objectives of a course and the students' actual achievements, and the need for higher education teachers to have at least some knowledge in the field of teaching. These ideas are still a topic of discussion in higher education today.

What is it that universities and teachers in higher education now face? Aoun (2017) writes that the 21st century brings with it the fourth industrial revolution and automation. These

changes are inevitable even when it comes to education, least of all at the higher level. Aoun is of the opinion that during the fourth industrial revolution, higher education in particular needs to create educational models that develop knowledge and skills impossible to replace with algorithms or robots: creativity, critical thinking, new (digital and other) forms of literacy, multiculturality, and entrepreneurship (Aoun, 2017). The chief characteristics of the universities of the future are therefore not linked as much to technological infrastructure or even employability as they are to the "Enlightenment" goals of university education.

How can we achieve these goals? Are the current methods good enough or do they need to be improved? The universities taking part in the INOVUP project are following the developments in the fields of pedagogy and psychology, according to which the success of higher education depends on many factors, but one of the most important is certainly the quality of teaching provided by teachers, teaching assistants, foreign language assistants, etc. It is difficult to define the quality of teaching and even more difficult to measure it, but it is undoubtedly connected to appropriate teacher training. How innovative the teaching methods are is not as relevant here as the use of methods that are suitable for achieving specific learning goals or developing the competencies set out in the curriculum. Can one method help us achieve all this? Probably not. Does the use of so-called innovative teaching methods necessarily make a difference? Again, no. The choice of teaching methodology is composed of a myriad of decisions that a teacher makes in accordance with the goals, content, students and circumstances under which the university course takes place.

Martin, Prosser, Trigwell, Ramsden, and Benjamin (2000) think that it is not so much the teacher's expertise or pedagogical knowledge that influence different styles of teaching, but what kind of knowledge the teacher wishes to impart to the students and how (with which methods or forms of teaching) he or she plans to achieve this. In the history of higher education teaching, there have been numerous debates as to which approaches are the most effective. In large part these debates were about empirical proof which would confirm or deny the effectiveness of student-centred teaching methods compared to content or teacher-centred ones. Although past results have indicated the different effects of the two approaches (e.g. Krumboltz & Farquhar, 1957; Webb & Baird, 1968), there seems to now be a more or less unified consensus on the benefits of methods that encourage active learning. Recent meta-analyses have repeatedly confirmed this as well (Chen & Yang, 2019; Cornelius-White, 2007; Deslauriers, Schelew, & Wieman, 2011; Schmidt, van der Molen, te Winkel, & Wijnen, 2009).

It is therefore not surprising that INOVUP is trying to encourage higher education teachers to "innovate" their own teaching practices by developing new approaches, improving on existing ones, and above all, sharing their experiences with colleagues and thereby encouraging the development of a community that will stay in place even after the project itself has come to an end. Of course, an overhaul of how the university study process is conducted alone will not make it possible to permanently improve the quality of higher education. This is particularly relevant in terms of using active learning methods with

university students – these usually take place in smaller groups, in well-equipped classrooms and with teachers with opportunities to further their own professional development. In view of this, the challenges universities face in developing and retaining a high standard of quality will be even greater than they are now after the INOVUP project is over.

The (thematic) issue of *Studies in Adult Education and Learning* includes six articles from the field of teaching in higher education.

In her introductory contribution, "Improving Teaching and Learning in Higher Education by Training Tertiary Level Educators in Slovenia – Developments, Experiences and Problems", Barica Marentič Požarnik describes the changes that have taken place in the teaching approaches in higher education over the past sixty years. The author emphasizes that efforts for improving teaching in higher education are not new and in fact have a long tradition in Slovenia. She presents the main forms, goals, content, methods, and achievements of teacher training in different time periods.

In the second article, "Promoting Active Learning as Perceived by Students", Katja Košir, Tina Vršnik Perše, Sabina Ograjšek and Milena Ivanuš Grmek explore the concept of student-centred teaching, which is based on encouraging the student's active role in the learning process. The authors stress that in order to successfully encourage this process, we need to understand the students' learning process. Their research deals with the question of how students perceive higher education in terms of active knowledge construction and connecting theory and practice.

"Potential for Using Student-Centred Teaching and Learning Methods in Biology Subjects at UP FAMNIT" analyses the student-centred learning and teaching aspects as well as ICT use in biological subjects. In their research, Živa Fišer and Alenka Baruca Arbeiter wanted to determine which teaching methods were used in practical classes with students of biological subjects. The results have shown that the approaches used by the respondents support and build on experiential learning, that there's no such thing as a "one size fits all" approach, and that higher education teachers make autonomous decisions about which approaches are suitable in terms of learning goals and content.

Concetta Tino's "An Integrative Interpretation of Personal and Contextual Factors of Students' Resistance to Active Learning and Teaching Strategies" also deals with student-centred approaches. Although their positive effects have been proven, the author points out that students do not always react to student-centred approaches in a positive way. A certain number of students, she writes, will always resist them. The reasons behind this vary and encompass both subjective and objective factors. Tino has developed some practical methods for reducing students' resistance, which are centred around establishing a learning ecosystem that encompasses all of the factors that potentially influence the students' negative attitudes to certain teaching and learning approaches.

In "The Professional Development of Teachers in Higher Education" Maja Mezgec provides illuminating insight into the models of professional development for higher

education teachers, considering both the factors that influence their professional development as well as its phases. Mezgec pays particular attention to on-the-job training and an overview of competencies. The first part of the article focuses on the doctoral degree as the foundation of a higher education teacher's career and professional development, and then examines the factors that affect their further and continuous professional development.

Monika Govekar-Okoliš and Nataša Kermavnar's "Nursing Mentoring and Mentors' Views on the Efficiency of University Students' Practice" presents the factors affecting the efficiency of the mentorship nursing students receive during their clinical practice. The purpose of the study is to determine the effects the mentorship of nurse mentors has and the ways it could be improved in future. The findings have indicated a need for the further pedagogical and andragogical training of the nurse mentors and for establishing an international network that would substantially contribute to their mentorship efficiency as well as improve the clinical practice experience and employment opportunities of nursing students.

Alenka Umek's article, "Reading Comprehension of Subject-specific Texts in a Foreign Language: The Role of Background Knowledge", determines the patterns used by students of business and economics when reading field-specific texts in a foreign language using the method of thinking out loud during reading. Umek has found that readers with strong prior knowledge in the field were more likely to correctly paraphrase, draw conclusions, explain, and evaluate information from the text. Readers with less prior knowledge were more likely to use a local approach to reading, focusing more on individual words. While talking about the text in Slovene, they also tended to use English expressions and inaccurate or inexact paraphrasing. In the conclusion, the author provides some tips for teaching foreign language reading skills and developing disciplinary literacy.

In the Reports, Replies and Reviews section, Monika Govekar-Okoliš, Katja Jeznik, Nika Breznikar and Klara Skubic Ermenc report on the *Days of Pedagogy and Andragogy*, which took place on 27th January 2020 at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. The final contribution comes from Klara Kožar Rosulnik, who reviewed Kalc, Milharčič Hladnik and Žitnik Serafin's book *Doba velikih migracij na Slovenskem* (*The Age of Great Slovenian Migration*).

This issue has come into being during the COVID-19 pandemic, a time that has required self-isolation and a transition to distance learning. A taxing social and pedagogical experiment, it can undoubtedly also make us reflect on our teaching practices. The editors of *Studies in Adult Education and Learning* hope that this thematic issue can help contribute to such reflection.

Marko Radovan

Financing

This paper is a result of research co-financed by the Republic of Slovenia and the European Union's European Social Fund as part of the Innovative Learning and Teaching in Higher Education project.

REFERENCES

Aoun, J. E. (2017). *Robot-proof: Higher education in the age of artificial intelligence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Chen, C.-H., & Yang, Y.-C. (2019). Revisiting the effects of project-based learning on students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis investigating moderators. *Educational Research Review*, *26*, 71–81.

Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, *77*(1), 113–143.

Deslauriers, L., Schelew, E., & Wieman, C. (2011). Improved Learning in a Large-Enrollment Physics Class. *Science*, *332*(6031), 862–864.

Klapper, P. (1950). Problems in College Teaching. *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, *36*(1), 53–63.

Krumboltz, J. D., & Farquhar, W. W. (1957). The effect of three teaching methods on achievement and motivational and outcomes in a how-to-study course. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, *71*(14), 1–26.

Marentič Požarnik, B. (1978). *Prispevek k visokošolski didaktiki*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Martin, E., Prosser, M., Trigwell, K., Ramsden, P., & Benjamin, J. (2000). What university teachers teach and how they teach it. *Instructional Science*, *28*(5), 387–412.

McKeachie, W. J. (1980). *Learning, Cognition, and College Teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schmidt, H. G., van der Molen, H. T., te Winkel, W. W. R., & Wijnen, W. H. F. W. (2009). Constructivist, problem-based learning does work: A meta-analysis of curricular comparisons involving a single medical school. *Educational Psychologist, 44*(4), 227–249.

Schmidt, V. (1972). *Visokošolska didaktika*. Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije.

Webb, C., & Baird, J. H. (1968). Learning Differences Resulting from Teacher- and Student-Centered Teaching Methods. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *39*(8), 456–460.