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In the last ten years, various studies have investigated the views of different groups of higher education staff and students about sustainability and its inclusion in university curricula, yet one staff group under-represented in the research is that of the educational developer. This project attempted to address this gap, by gathering educational developer perspectives about sustainability in the curriculum. It sought to capture their views about a national level sustainable development policy, their opinions on the relationship between educational development and pro-sustainability curriculum change, and whether, therefore, sustainability should form part of their own roles. The study was informed by the ‘theory of the second best’ and involved nine interviews. Educational developers identified several concerns with the policy, whilst opinions about their own involvement in sustainability were very diverse. It is argued that sustainability policy should be developed through clearer statements about curriculum, and that it is informed by, and speaks to educational developers and other staff groups. It is also suggested that there are opportunities for educational developers to make contributions to the progression of sustainability, but that individual departments and staff should make decisions about such involvement.
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**Research focus**

During the last ten years, a substantial number of studies have investigated the views and experiences of different groups of higher education staff (for example, Reid & Petocz, 2006) and students (Drayson, Bone, Agombar & Kemp, 2013) about sustainability and its inclusion in university curricula. However, one staff group under-represented in the research is that of the educational developer. This poses a concern, because if sustainability is to be included in more curricula, who are normally involved in curricula enhancement work at their own institutions (Clegg, 2009). My project attempts to address this gap by gathering educational developer perspectives about sustainability in the curriculum. It seeks to capture their views about a particular, national level sustainability policy, their opinions on the relationship between educational development and pro-sustainability curriculum change, and whether sustainability in the curriculum should form part of their own roles. The research questions are as follows:

1. How useful is the (UK) Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE, 2009) *Sustainable development in higher education* policy in providing direction and guidance about pro-sustainability curriculum change?

- Should the policy provide fuller consideration about sustainability in the curriculum?

2. What involvement should the educational development community have in guiding pro-sustainability curriculum change?

- Should sustainability in the curriculum be an area of responsibility for educational developers?

The outcomes of the work are considered through reference to the ‘theory of the second best’ (Lipsey & Lancaster, 1956-7), a theory of welfare economics. These outcomes should be of value to policy makers, staff and students involved in curriculum, and to educational developers. It is also hoped that the project will yield some insight on whether there exists a natural, but under-explored, link between educational development on the one hand and sustainability on the other. At a time when both fields face their own challenges (for example, demonstrating their value to the sector), it might be that more could be done to link them together. It will be argued that sustainability should not be imposed on educational developers, but that it is an issue that provides an opportunity for that community. It will also be suggested that policy needs to provide greater exposure of, and direction about, sustainability in the curriculum. The next two sections elucidate on the policy and the educational developer role respectively, and are followed with a discussion of relevant literature and a theoretical grounding for the study.

**Policy context**

In the last 10-15 years, and mirroring activity in many other countries, UK higher education institutions (HEIs) have been encouraged to adopt more pro-sustainability practices. This is partly attributable to initiatives such as the Green Academy (Higher Education Academy, 2011), the Universities UK ‘statement of intent’ (2010), and sustainable development policy (HEFCE, 2005, 2009), the last of which forms the starting point for this project. HEFCE published its first sustainable development policy in 2005 and its web link opens with an ambitious statement:

Our vision is that, within the next 10 years, the sector… will be recognised as a major contributor to society’s efforts to achieve sustainability – through the skills and knowledge that its graduates learn and put into practice, its research and exchange of knowledge through business, community and public policy engagement, and through its own strategies and operations (p. 3).

Whilst the policy attracted some negative responses (Knight, 2005), HEFCE published a second edition in 2009, stating ‘Higher education institutions can make a substantial, sustained and exemplary contribution to the challenge of sustainable development through teaching and research, as campus managers, as employers and as protagonists in their local communities’ (p. 3). This second edition also considers the potential for student involvement. Its aims are mapped through a series of support roles, including employer engagement, construction and refurbishment, information technology, and curricula and pedagogy. However, curricula and pedagogy roles are handled briefly, the emphasis seemingly placed on profile-raising such issues as opposed to providing specific directions.

The policy applies to a particular national context and there are, of course, others of this type. Nevertheless, the analysis of a particular policy should offer some insights to those involved in sustainability beyond the boundaries to which this one applies.

**The educational developer role**

The educational developer role focuses on enhancing teaching and learning, promoting high quality teaching through academic programmes, seminars and workshops, and supporting staff in areas of pedagogy. Shay (2012, p. 311) defines educational development as ‘...a range of development and research practices aimed at the professionalization of teaching and learning in higher education, most commonly associated with various forms of student, staff, curriculum and policy development’. Clegg (2009) refers to it as an emerging ‘field of practice’ (p. 405), and Shay (2012, p. 313) adds guidance as to what such a field of practice is: ‘Professional fields are ‘regions’ where disciplinary knowledge is ‘re-contextualised’ to address problems in the field of practice’ adding ‘…there seems to be a broad consensus that educational development is a distinctive field of practice…’. For this work, I adopt Shay’s (2012) definition of educational development and Clegg’s view that it is regarded as a field of practice. In addition, Debowski (2014) argues that the educational developer role has shifted from merely being a teaching and learning ‘expert’ towards one based on ‘…a more adaptive, collaborative partnership model’ (p. 50). It is this partnership role which I later argue educational developers can provide in their work with colleagues about pro-sustainability curriculum change.

**Sustainability in higher education**

Sustainability is attracting significant interest in higher education, its profile heightened by various initiatives. Wright (2002) traces back the relationship between sustainability and higher education, documenting national and international sustainability declarations applicable to the sector. According to Reid and Petocz (2006), issues specific to education for sustainable development (ESD) were first raised at the Rio Earth Summit (1992), whilst the United Nations Decade for ESD (2005-2014) provided further opportunities for institutions to engage. However, sustainability and sustainable development have proven difficult terms to define, Williams and Millington (2004) describing the latter as a ‘…notoriously difficult, slippery and elusive concept’ (p. 99). In view of this lack of consensus, I provided four definitions to participants of my study:

[Sustainability is about] development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (United Nations, 1987)

It is concerned with transformative education and development to create global citizens who are stewards of sustainability (Sterling, 2001)

Sustainability efforts are defined broadly to include changes in campus operations, financial and administrative planning and/or policy, and/or academic curricula and research that facilitate positive environmental changes (Brinkhurst, Rose, Maurice & Ackerman, 2011, p. 340)

Sustainability is a concept, a goal, and a strategy. The concept speaks to the reconciliation of social justice, ecological integrity and the well being of all living systems on the planet. The goal is create an ecologically and socially just world within the means of nature without compromising future generations. Sustainability also refers to the process or strategy of moving towards a sustainable future (Moore, 2005, p. 327, adapted from a definition by Fien, 2002).

These definitions relate to sustainability *in* higher education and *in* curricula, suggesting that sustainable values and actions represent positive ambitions, but other authors use the term in conjunction with the sustainability *of* areas or practices. For example, Brew and Cahir (2013) discuss sustainability and learning and teaching initiatives in terms ‘…of a sustainable approach to ever-changing learning and teaching priorities’ (p. 1). This use is distinctive from the one used here, since Brew and Cahir consider the sustainability *of* educational development work, whilst I am interested in sustainability as potentially *being part of* educational development.

***Sustainability in the curriculum***

For some authors, the notion of sustainable curricula represents an opportunity, Orr (2002, p. 96) arguing: ‘…no institutions in modern society are better situated and more obliged to facilitate the transition to a sustainable future than colleges and universities’ (p. 221). Indeed, several authors provide examples of sustainability informed curricula in HEIs in Europe and North America (Barlett & Chase, 2013; Jones, Selby & Sterling, 2010), and models have been proposed for achieving this - Hopkinson, Hughes and Layer (2008) outline a curriculum framework combining formal, informal and campus elements. However, though many universities have achieved more sustainable estates, curriculum change remains a more challenging endeavour (De La Harpe & Thomas, 2009). In spite of this, Drayson et al. (2013) found that some 80% of UK students would like to see sustainability promoted at their institutions, with two thirds wanting it to be included in their programmes of study.

There are also variations in understandings of the curriculum. Fraser and Bosanquet (2006) found that it carries different meanings in different contexts, which influences how staff approach curriculum development. Similarly, Fraser’s (2006) phenomenographic research yielded four different conceptions of curriculum amongst academics. What are the implications of these multiple conceptions of curriculum for educational developers involved in curricula change? O’Neill (2010, p. 62) argues that curriculum revision is a ‘…complex and often poorly understood process’, and that educational developers should be flexible in their work and sensitive to the context in which curriculum revision is taking place.

Overall, whilst there are some compelling arguments for including sustainability in curricula, there are challenges at the levels of conceptualisation and application, such that an educational developer perspective might be of value.

**Theory and research design**

Sustainability is not a well-theorised area, Fien (2002) describing it as ‘…predominantly atheoretical’ (p. 144). It has been explored through Social Practice Theory (Trowler, Hopkinson & Comerford Boyes, 2013) and Barnett (2011) examined ‘four imaginaries of the university’, including the ‘ecological university’.

This project draws on the ‘theory of the second best’ (Lipsey & Lancaster, 1956-7), which has its origins in welfare economics and has been applied to educational research on sustainability before (Cotton, Bailey, Warren & Bissell, 2009). Its starting point is the ‘ideal state’ of an issue, and that achievement of this state depends on meeting certain underlying variables. Cotton et al. (2009) explain that reaching an ideal state in ESD might include institutional reviews of policy and practice or pedagogical reform. However, other agendas – such as employability or student satisfaction – could make this difficult. Where ‘optimality conditions’ cannot be met, it might be better to aim for a compromise, such that: ‘…seeking ‘second best’ solutions may provide a way of making progress, and stimulating processes of reflection and cultural transition’ (p. 732). The absence of a variable for ‘first best’ does not imply that a next-best state is secured by the remaining variables, and may call for other variables to be removed, so that second-best maybe a distinct state (Free Exchange, 2007). The theory was used here because it has been applied before in sustainability research and because this project is being undertaken at a time of considerable sectorial change.

My research involved seeking in-depth accounts from educational developers, so a qualitative approach was adopted, comprising semi-structured interviews. The research questions were addressed at two levels, these being *cross-institution*, involving six educational developers at six different universities, and *single-institution*, in which four interviews were undertaken with staff in a single department. For the cross-institutionlevel, a purposive sample strategy was used, such that participants had varied levels of experience and seniority, but all were working in roles judged to fit in with Shay’s (2012) definition of educational development. The sample incorporated staff at both established and newer (‘post-1992’) institutions, in different regions of the country. Participants had different levels of experience of sustainability, from minimal to considerable. For the single-institution level, four educational developers were interviewed at one university, to enable additional insights to be gained. This institution provided for an interesting case study: whereas many institutions that have espoused sustainability have been newer or less research active, this one is established and research-based, yet it has addressed sustainability in visible ways.

The interview schedule was structured under four sections, the first of which was designed to ease in participants. The second raised questions about the HEFCE policy, whilst the third incorporated narrative questions to encourage participants to provide storied accounts about their roles in sustainability. Interviews were wound down with opportunities for raising any further points. Ethical approval was obtained.

**Implementation and analysis**

Participants for the cross-institutional study were invited to take part by email, with six staff (from seven invitations) accepting. For one of these institutions, three additional educational developers were interviewed, to form the single-institution study. Documents for reading were emailed to each person in advance, comprising an information sheet, consent form, contextual information including the definitions of sustainability provided above, and a copy of the policy. Interviews took approximately 40 minutes each and were transcribed by myself. Participants were each given a modest incentive payment to recognise their contributions.

Data for the cross-institution and single-institution studies were considered separately. Although transcripts were analysed in relation to the research questions, an inductive approach was employed, in that I was searching for any additional issues that the data revealed. First, each transcript was read in its entirety to ‘…build a sense of the whole’ (Bazeley, 2013, p. 101). I then adopted a code and retrieval system, involving organising and refining codes in a hierarchical manner (Bazeley, 2013). Codes were revised until data saturation was reached, sufficient numbers of regularities had been formed (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and the most accurate possible rendering of the findings had been achieved. For analysis of the narrative sections, attention was paid to *how* participants recounted their stories, drawing on guidance provided by Cousin (2009). The analysis led to the development of two sets of higher order codes which were further refined until a final set of themes was generated.

**Findings**

The findings are organised under the two levels of study. Participant names have been changed.

***Cross-institution level***

*Theme 1: There are positive aspects of the policy*

When asked to comment on their views of the policy, participants identified several aspects which they felt were beneficial, particularly its reference to student involvement:

The good thing is that it makes reasonable reference about student engagement. (Thomas)

I thought it was a classic policy document… upbeat and high level. Quite a lot of motherhood and apple pie. (Juliette)

The emphasis on student involvement provides an early opportunity to revisit the theory of the second best, because closer engagement with students may offer a more suitable mechanism for progression of sustainability issues.

*Theme 2: There are weaknesses in the policy, particularly in its lack of curriculum coverage*

There was strong consensus that whilst the policy addressed campus environmental issues well, it was weaker and vaguer in its handling of curriculum:

It’s focused on climate change and so taking an ecological stance to sustainability, which I think is problematic. It’s really problematic in terms of getting it through the university and trying to get it into the curriculum. (Thomas)

When they get to more ethereal things like how it might influence our understanding of what we would do, it’s a bit vague, we’ll just have a nice title that says, institutions will of course think about this in relation to their curriculum. (Steve)

One participant offered a different view:

I think they’re right to be indicating that any more substantive thought around the shaping of curricula and degree programmes really is something for institutions to be taking the lead on. (Juliette)

Participants identified other weaknesses, including the following:

It doesn’t say anything about staff development… At the moment I think we’re at the stage where people don’t really understand the issue enough to know whether they’re for it or against. (Susan)

It’s such an aspirational, big document. It’s got the employability, the students, the case studies. I was struggling to find the one thread, the take-home point. (Claudia)

Some issues were raised multiple times, for example, four participants indicated that it lacked actions and directions.

*Theme 3: Approaches for including sustainability in curricula*

Participants offered various opinions about how sustainability could be integrated into curricula. Ironically, such an outcome might lend some justification to policy writers *not* taking a particular stance on this:

I would like to see a sense that institutions have a core set of values within which [sustainability] is embodied, and then that the curricula we define at the institution should be drawn from those values. (Steve)

Many institutions have gone along with the Australian model of identifying these dimensions… we did the same. I thought hard about how to get sustainability in there and it is in there as one of the areas. That meant the institution was committed to this agenda. (Thomas)

Having sustainability as something that infuses across the whole curriculum is a better way of embedding… but we also have a separate [module]. So there is a bit of me that would like to see an introduction to sustainability module that was either open to all or required to be taken by all students. (Susan)

The hesitation I would have would be around having something like a themed module, they tend to be identified as being marginalised, slightly peripheral. (Juliette)

We can extrapolate three ideas about pro-sustainability curriculum change from these findings. First, some form of explicit inclusion of sustainability in curricula. Second, sustainability may be infused as a value, across the curriculum. Third, learners could have some ‘say’ in identifying what is important in their curricula, and this should influence whether and how sustainability is addressed.

*Theme 4: Educational developers can play a role in sustainability*

In the second section of interviews, participants were invited to offer their views about whether sustainability in the curriculum could form part of their own roles. Views were both strong and diverse:

The more strands of work we’re involved in, the better chance there is of [senior managers] noticing educational development input. I’m not sure that grassroots sustainability is something that can save educational development, but I think it’s something where educational development units ought to be getting engaged. (Kevin)

I think that educational development is definitely a unique opportunity to get an audience for this. (Claudia)

It’s one of the most important things that our culture and society has got to deal with and we know we can’t keep on, we’re going to peak in many materials and those sorts of things. But it’s also something that seems to switch people off because they don’t want to change. Unless you’ve got people who are well trained up, with strong sustainability literacy, then we’re not doing our business well. So I think that absolutely we have a role. (Thomas)

Others suggested that educational developers should contribute by including ESD in staff development programmes:

Staff development seems even more important than saying students should be exposed to this. Let’s start with staff and get staff at a level where they at least understand what we’re having this conversation about. (Susan)

It would be a good inclusion… it offers an opportunity to have a discussion about the purpose of higher education and the wider role in society. (Claudia)

*Theme 5: There are concerns associated with educational developers being involved in sustainability*

Participants also expressed scepticism about being involved, although these did not map to full-scale rejection:

I would need to have more subject knowledge… around ways in which one could think about teaching and learning in more sustainable ways. I would need quite a lot of education myself. (Juliette)

You’ve got no consensus as to how to do this. You’ve got quality assurance systems and institutional structures which are not allowing you to do things easily or well. It’s almost like the whole debate challenges the university at its core. (Thomas)

Alternative ideas were proposed, again incorporating a student involvement:

There’s likely to be a lot gained through looking at institutional processes and engagement with the student body. We need to remember that there’s more going on in a university than, in inverted commas, learning and teaching… the power of the culture or the co-curricula or extra-curricula activity is huge. I think that’s where modes of interaction and partnerships with students, student-bodies, staff-bodies, can yield a lot. (Juliette)

Overall, much was said about possible connections between educational development and sustainability.

*Theme 6: Sustainability has been de-prioritised as compared with other agendas*

Participants suggested that progressing sustainability issues was challenging, due to other agendas in their institutions and in the sector:

It seems to have been so important a few years ago but now it’s all about student satisfaction. (Claudia)

The VC came in and looked at the stats and said, we’re doing really badly in employability. So when we were developing our [sustainability] award, we didn’t know the employability group was developing an award. Of course the one that gets the resource is going to be employability. (Thomas)

There are whole issues around student partnership and funding and fees and all that. It’s understandable, there are huge changes. (Susan)

The evidence suggests that other policy is impacting negatively on the progression of sustainability, indicating a need for re-thinking *how* sustainability can gain profile. The theory of the second best might, then, have some appeal.

***Single-institution level***

The following themes were developed from the single-institution study.

*Theme 1: There are positive aspects of the policy*

The opening theme matches that provided at cross-institution level, albeit with more emphasis on the awareness-raising function of the policy.

Stuff about estates and finance makes sense. Universities should be responsible, taking the lead in carbon emissions and green issues. (Frances)

I think [for] some departments, it is of direct relevance to what they are teaching. If you’re teaching about hotel management, or you’re talking about budgeting, heating costs and carbon footprints. (Paul)

*Theme 2: The policy features a series of weaknesses*

Participants were critical, focusing their points around the lack of curriculum coverage:

It’s one of those documents where you read through it and go, fair enough, I can’t really argue with that. It’s almost worded as though it doesn’t want to offend anybody. You know, let’s be sustainable, great. (Paul)

While reading it, it was always, I agree with this, but it’s like stating that every child should have a roof over its head. (Lloyd)

We know that getting deep-seated curriculum change is really hard, and there was nothing in there which said that what we have to do is get universities to take this on board in planning curriculum issues. (Frances)

*Theme 3: Sustainability should not be imposed in curricula, but included using a praxis model*

Participants advocated that sustainability should not form a separate topic in curricula, instead tending towards a praxis approach, infusing sustainability as a value:

The easiest thing to do to make it visible would be to say it has to be in the curriculum for each discipline. But then it will just be another of those generic things. (Steve)

If I was to start making it separate, I would be roving into content areas, and I don’t think that’s what I’m about as an academic developer. It’s not a separate element, it’s about the way we think about what we do. (Frances)

Part of our jobs in supporting academics should be looking at how they develop the curriculum and what values and ideologies underlie the curriculum. We should be looking at something different, like Stenhouse’s view of curriculum as process and praxis. (Frances)

*Theme 4: Sustainability should not form part of the educational developer role*

In contrast to findings of the broader-based study, staff at this institution were largely against sustainability becoming part of the educational developer role:

I’m not the subject expert... If somebody says to me I’m interested in sustainability, then I’m happy to help them find people who are experts. But I’m not the person with the sandwich boards going round saying be sustainable. (Paul)

I think if you’d started that, there would be a danger of people thinking that it’s yet another thing being imposed by educational developers. (Frances)

I don’t feel that it should be my role to push that agenda… I don’t want to say in my own way, here’s a tick list of things that we must cover: sustainability. The danger of doing that is that it may damage the [teaching] approaches that people take that they genuinely believe in. (Steve)

*Theme 5: The momentum of sustainability has declined*

Findings are similar to those expressed in the cross-institution study:

There will be champions of environmental sustainability who may wave it around, but it’s not something I’ve heard discussed at any committee. (Paul)

I’m worried that this is no longer a real issue on the agenda. The momentum of sustainability has dipped because there are now larger concerns with unemployment amongst graduates. (Lloyd)

These two sets of findings, representing the cross-institution and single-institution levels of study, will now be compared and discussed.

**Discussion**

This project sought to address a ‘gap’ in the literature, through its consideration of educational developer views about the current *Sustainable development in higher education* policy and its guidance about curriculum, and by inviting educational developers to comment on what involvement they could have in pro-sustainability curriculum change.

Participants were positive about the development of the policy and the involvement of students in it. However, they felt it lacked guidance about the curriculum. Views were similar at cross-institution and single-institution levels, although there were distinctive ideas about *how* sustainability could be included in curricula, with the broader study yielding three different suggestions and those at the individual institution showing a preference for it to be infused through a praxis approach. For the second question, participants offered fascinating narratives about whether their roles could incorporate sustainability, with some welcoming the idea and others opposed to it. At the cross-institutional level, participants were broadly in favour of developing links, though they had some reservations. Conversely, those in the single institution generally rejected sustainability as a professional role. For these participants, involvement in curricula did not necessarily translate to involvement in sustainability informed curricula.

It was hoped the outcomes of the project might provide some perspective about whether there exists a link between educational development and sustainable development. Some participants identified connections, whilst others perceived them to be distinct. In fact, the two fields *are* distinct, and it is not advocated here that sustainability should be imposed on educational developers, nor that educational developers should impose it on other staff. However, in situations in which staff or students do wish to link or apply sustainability to their curricula, there surely are opportunities for educational developers to advise and collaborate and, in this sense, there *is* a shared interest between the two, findings collected in this study largely supporting this argument.

It is worth revisiting the theory of the second best to consider if it might cast further light on the findings. At the current time, curriculum change for sustainability is a niche, if growing area. Major reform of this type seems unlikely to occur in the short term, partly due to concurrent, larger-scale agendas. Nevertheless, participants did identify alternative ideas such as using staff development programmes, promoting sustainability as an institutional value, and developing initiatives with students. The last of these is being enacted upon by organisations such as HEFCE, their funding of projects with the National Union of Students (NUS) attracting considerable interest (NUS, 2013). The theory can, therefore, offer some assistance in identifying alternative strategies whilst, as Cotton et al. (2009) add, it makes us aware of other change agendas, thus encouraging us to consider alternative ideas for working around these agendas. We need to be mindful of the fact that the theory has been applied to a context different from that for which it was originally intended, yet it has value in showing that whilst first best solutions are desirable, they may not be feasible. It is recognised that this was a small-scale project, and it would be useful to seek the views of a larger sample of educational developers, particularly because staff in these roles tend to focus on different activities, depending on, for example, institutional priorities, and these differences are likely to inform how they engage with the issues raised in this study.

The report closes with the following recommendations. First, educational developers interviewed in this study provided ideas that can inform future sustainability policy. On this basis, it is argued that the policy should provide greater consideration of sustainability in the curriculum, a forthcoming third edition providing an opportunity to do so. Second, similar to other policies addressing teaching and learning issues, this one needs to be *informed by* and *speak to* educational developers, because such policies concern issues which fall under the educational development remit.

For educational developers themselves, sustainability may never be a core activity, but it does create opportunities. Participants in this study appeared to have two conceptions of sustainability in the curriculum: as an *explicit area of knowledge* and as a *value or attribute*. I would advocate that both views should be accounted for in curriculum change, as neither is enough on its own: *only* adding sustainability may simply generate a ‘tick-box’ exercise, but *only* promoting it as a value may render it invisible. It might also be the case that views of sustainability in the curriculum can be attributed to different conceptions of the curriculum itself, a view consistent with the findings of Fraser (2006). Therefore, educational developers and course designers could work together to look at different methods for integrating sustainability into particular curricula, accounting for disciplinary differences, and advice about curriculum change provided by authors such as O’Neill (2010). Ultimately, if we want to achieve authentic pro-sustainability curriculum change, this calls for more exploratory work in different disciplines, fuller consideration of appropriate teaching methods and approaches for ESD, and further student involvement. These issues are relevant to both policy makers and to educational developers.

**Concluding comments**

This project examined educational developer views about sustainability policy and their own roles in sustainability. In light of the findings, it is recommended that future sustainability policy addresses sustainability in the curriculum more extensively, and is informed by and speaks to educational developers and other groups of students and staff. Universities have the capacity, the ability, and arguably, the responsibility, to promote positive sustainability behaviours amongst their students and staff, and educational developers can make a contribution to this, based on their expertise in learning, teaching, curriculum, and other areas of pedagogy.**References**
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