

UDC 378.147:37.091.3

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31359/1993-0941-2025-49-424>

I. V. Kostenko, Ph.D., Researcher Scientific Research Institute of the State Building and Local Government of National Academy of Law Sciences of Ukraine
ORCID ID : 0000-0002-8784-5422

INTEGRATING THE UK PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS FRAMEWORK 2023 INTO ACADEMIC TEACHING: A PATHWAY TO REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

Abstract. *This article presents a theoretical and methodological analysis of the potential integration of the updated UK Professional Standards Framework for Teaching and Supporting Learning in Higher Education (UKPSF, 2023) as a systemic instrument for advancing reflective pedagogical practice. The conceptual foundations of reflection in academic teaching are examined through the lens of Donald Sch n's dual model of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, as well as Stephen Brookfield's «four lenses» approach to critical self-inquiry. Particular attention is given to the interplay between professional values, core knowledge, and areas of activity that constitute the structure of the UKPSF and underpin the formation of a reflective pedagogical identity.*

Within the broader context of digital transformation, student partnership, formative assessment, and academic integrity, the Framework is explored as both a normative-ethical and practice-oriented benchmark for modernising teaching practices in higher education.

The study is grounded in an interpretative methodological framework, incorporating content analysis, comparative inquiry, and elements of case study analysis. The article substantiates the relevance and feasibility of adapting the UKPSF within the Ukrainian higher education context as a means of enhancing

educational quality and cultivating a culture of critical reflection and ethical professionalism within academic institutions.

Keywords: *UKPSF 2023; reflective practice; pedagogical identity; professional values; critical thinking; higher education teaching; assessment; student partnership; digitalisation of education; academic integrity.*

Introduction. In the context of the rapid transformation of higher education, driven by globalisation, digitalisation, and increased expectations regarding the quality of the educational process, the enhancement of teachers' professional competence becomes particularly significant. Traditional teaching models are losing their effectiveness in the new sociocultural reality, where flexibility, critical thinking, lifelong learning, and the ability to reflect come to the forefront [5; 6; 12].

In this context, the updated version of the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF, 2023) emerges as a tool for aligning values, competencies, and standards of teaching activities in higher education [3]. It outlines clear guidelines for academic staff, defining three main components: areas of activity, core knowledge, and professional values [3]. One of the key elements of the UKPSF is reflective practice, which not only enhances the professional responsibility of the educator but also creates conditions for their self-development, improvement of pedagogical strategies, and formation of an ethical teaching culture [2; 8; 16].

The theoretical foundation of the concept of reflection as a professional skill traces back to the works of Donald Schön, who in his book *The Reflective Practitioner* argued that the quality of a specialist's work is based on their ability to think «in action» (reflection-in-action) and «on action» (reflection-on-action), which ensures a more profound understanding of practical experience [16]. Schön's ideas were further developed in the works of Brookfield, particularly in his «four lenses» model, which involves the integration of self-observation, feedback from students, colleagues' insights, and analysis of scholarly literature [8]. Such multidimensional reflection is recognised in contemporary pedagogy as an effective way to develop the critical self-awareness of the educator.

Modern approaches to forming a reflective educator emphasise the combination of critical thinking, self-reflection, and empathy as key elements of teaching identity [12; 10]. Specifically, bell hooks in her work *Teaching Critical Thinking* emphasised that thinking is an act of freedom, and critical thinking in education is a tool for emancipation [12]. This approach resonates with Lave & Wenger's idea of learning as a form of social participation, where reflection emerges not only as a cognitive but also as a social process, closely tied to the context [14].

The integration of reflective practice into the educational process also requires consideration of feedback principles, which contribute to the development of self-regulated learning. Adcroft [1] criticises the common myths about feedback in the university environment, pointing out that the effectiveness of feedback depends on its context, interaction, and reflective assimilation. In turn, the model of the seven principles of quality feedback, developed by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick [15], emphasises the importance of active student participation in the assessment process and the development of self-correction abilities.

The digitalisation of education has created new opportunities for the development of reflective practices, but at the same time, new challenges. The integration of digital tools, particularly generative artificial intelligence, as noted in the University of Leicester's policy [17], necessitates a constant review of teaching and learning methods and, consequently, a deeper reflection on ethical and didactic aspects. Ferrell [9] emphasises that the digital environment requires not only technological adaptation but also pedagogical rethinking: from linear knowledge transmission to the creation of flexible, student-centred, reflective educational practices.

Thus, the combination of UKPSF provisions with the concept of reflective practice not only enhances the quality of teaching but also contributes to the development of academic integrity, lecturer autonomy, and the culture of the educational environment. This is especially important in the Ukrainian context, where the formation of an effective, virtuous, and student-orientated education is a strategic priority for higher education.

Research Methods. The study has a qualitative methodological focus using an interpretative approach, which allows for a deep analysis of pedagogical processes, particularly the integration of the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF) 2023 into educational practice. The main methods include an analytical literature review and comparative analysis, as well as elements of reflective analysis of teaching activities based on the concept of critical reflection.

In the course of the research, a targeted selection of literature was made, highlighting both the structure and philosophy of the UKPSF [3], as well as key approaches to teaching reflection [2; 8; 16], professional identity development [6; 12], learning environment organisation [4; 5; 13], assessment principles [1; 7; 15], and digital transformations in the educational process [9; 17].

The analytical part is based on content analysis methods applied to Advance HE documents [2; 3] and the educational policy of the University of Leicester [17], as well as on structural-functional analysis of models such as

- the model of the reflective practicum by D. Schön [16],
- four lenses of reflection by S. Brookfield [8],
- professional values and principles of the UKPSF [3],
- approach to self-assessment and feedback Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick [15].

To better understand pedagogical reflection in the context of UKPSF, elements of the case-study method were used, where typical scenarios of reflective practice in a real educational environment are analysed (for example, the cases described in the works of Healey et al. [10] and Herrmann [11]).

Moreover, the research is based on the principles of academic integrity, ensuring apparent referenceto all sources, open interpretation of results, and a refusal to falsify or distort data. The use of combined methods allows for a reasoned description of the potential of UKPSF as a tool for developing reflective teaching practice, revealing interdisciplinary connections, and identifying effective educational strategies relevant to the contemporary challenges of higher education.

Discussion.

UKPSF 2023: From Framework to Reflective Pedagogy. Expanding on the topic of integrating the UK Professional Standards Framework

(UKPSF, 2023) into contemporary academic practice, it is worth delving deeper into its substantive and conceptual content as a universal tool for pedagogical professionalisation, with an emphasis on reflectiveness, ethics, and evidence-based practices. This allows for a transition from the declarative level of standards to their methodological application in teaching activities, which is the essence of the Framework.

Methodological foundation of UKPSF: systemness, flexibility, and reflection The UKPSF 2023 document clearly defines its purpose: to create a tool that allows both individuals and institutions to enhance the quality of teaching through a critically evaluative, reflective, and evidence-based approach to teaching and supporting the learning process (UKPSF, 2023, p. 2) [3]. In this concept, the defining aspect is the process of professional reflection on one's activities, which is based on the awareness of the interconnections between values, knowledge, and actions.

Structural Dimensions of the UKPSF: Values, Knowledge, Activity.

Structurally, the UKPSF is based on three interdependent sets of so-called «Dimensions»: Professional Values, Core Knowledge, and Areas of Activity. Each element of these sets is significant only in relation to the others. For example, key knowledge has no educational weight if it is not applied in relevant activities that simultaneously align with professional values [3, pp. 3–4].

Such a threefold foundation allows the instructor to work not only within established didactic templates but also to critically analyse, adapt, and rethink their own strategies, taking into account both context (local and global) and changes in student-centered pedagogy. This is the essence of reflective practice, which has become a fundamental tenet of the modern educational paradigm.

Professional Values: The Ethical Compass of Pedagogy. One of the most significant aspects of the UKPSF is the emphasis on professional values (V1 – V5), which serve as an ethical framework for educators. According to the Framework, these values not only set the tone for professional behaviour but also support the application of knowledge and the implementation of activities, making them key in building educational identity [3, p. 4].

They include:

V1 – respect for the individual characteristics of learners and the diversity of their groups;

V2 – promoting engagement in education and ensuring equal opportunities for all;

V3 – the use of research results, scientific approaches, or professional training as the basis for effective practice;

V4 – responding to the broader context of higher education functioning, taking into account its impact on practice;

V5 – collaboration with others to improve educational activities.

The content of each value position is aimed at developing reflective thinking: the instructor must not only know how to teach but also why they choose a particular approach and what its consequences are for students, the academic environment, and society. This is not a declarative but a deeply practice-oriented ethical approach.

Core Knowledge: The Cognitive Foundation for Effective Action
The second systemic component of the Framework is Core Knowledge (K1 – K5) – the foundation upon which teaching effectiveness is based. Knowledge here is viewed not as factual awareness, but as an understanding of the mechanisms underlying the educational process:

K1 – how students learn (in general and within specific subjects);

K2 – teaching approaches appropriate to the subject and level of study;

K3 – critical evaluation as the basis of effective practice;

K4 – use of digital technologies and educational resources;

K5 – requirements for quality assurance and improvement and their impact on practice [3, p. 4].

Thus, the Framework involves the application of not only general pedagogical knowledge but also subject-specific, technological, and contextual expertise, which must be integrated into real educational interactions. Moreover, this knowledge cannot be applied automatically – it requires adaptation through constant pedagogical reflection.

Areas of Activity: the practical dimension of professionalism
The third component – areas of activity (A1 – A5) – is aimed at demonstrating how professional values and knowledge are implemented in teaching practice. This includes:

A1 – designing educational activities and programs;
A2 – teaching or supporting learning;
A3 – evaluation and feedback provision;
A4 – support and guidance for students;
A5 – improving practice through continuous professional development [3, p. 5].

In the context of reflective pedagogy, A5 is particularly significant as a direct requirement for the teacher’s self-analysis, critical evaluation of the impact of their activities on student learning, and planning ways for improvement. This component demonstrates that reflection in the UKPSF is not an optional practice but a necessary condition for maintaining professionalism. By embedding reflective inquiry into the framework of continuing professional development, A5 fosters a dynamic model of lifelong learning, where teaching is viewed as an evolving process shaped by context, evidence, and critical self-assessment.

Such positioning of reflection within the UKPSF aligns closely with broader educational discourses that recognise professional growth not merely as a formal process of skill acquisition but as a transformative engagement with one’s own values, assumptions, and pedagogical choices. Reflection thus acts as a bridge between action and meaning-making, enabling educators to link their daily teaching decisions with larger educational goals and ethical commitments.

Reflection as a Professional Duty: From Toolkit to Pedagogical Habits. Reflective practice, as noted in the Reflective Practice Toolkit developed by Advance HE, is positioned not merely as a pedagogical recommendation but as a strategic, structured and integral element of ongoing professional development in higher education. This practice enables educators to transcend routine performance by consciously engaging in a cyclical process of observation, analysis, interpretation, and planning, which supports deeper self-awareness and continuous improvement in teaching and learning strategies [2].

The Toolkit emphasises that reflection is not an isolated act, but a systematic, recursive process grounded in critical thinking and informed decision-making. Specifically, it outlines several key principles of effective reflective practice:

- Purposeful engagement with experience – encouraging educators to identify specific moments or patterns in their teaching that warrant closer examination.

- Questioning assumptions – prompting critical interrogation of established beliefs, methods, and institutional norms.

- Integration of multiple perspectives – including feedback from students, colleagues, and scholarly sources, thereby aligning closely with Brookfield's «four lenses» model (which will be examined in the next section).

- Linking reflection to action – ensuring that insights derived from reflection lead to tangible modifications or enhancements in pedagogical practice.

This approach underscores that adequate reflection is both evidence-informed and improvement-oriented. It is not merely contemplative but inherently transformative, aiming to reshape the educator's identity, teaching methods, and interaction with the learning environment. The Toolkit highlights that reflection supports the development of resilience, pedagogical agility, and ethical responsiveness – qualities essential for educators operating within complex and changing academic landscapes [2].

Moreover, Advance HE distinguishes between informal and formal reflective practices, suggesting that both spontaneous (in-the-moment) and structured (documented, peer-reviewed, or portfolio-based) reflections are valuable and mutually reinforcing. This directly complements the reflective dimensions embedded in the UKPSF 2023, particularly within Area of Activity A5, which calls for deliberate and continual enhancement of professional practice.

In essence, the Reflective Practice Toolkit reinforces the idea that reflective thinking should be integrated into the very fabric of professional identity, not treated as an ancillary or occasional task. It calls educators to develop reflective habits that are intentional, methodologically grounded, and action driven. Thus, reflection is portrayed as the driver of pedagogical excellence, cultivating not only more adaptive and student-centred teaching but also contributing to the broader institutional culture of quality and integrity in higher education.

Dual Reflection in Action: Donald Sch n's Model. This position resonates with the ideas of Donald Sch n, who in his work *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (1983) proposed the concept of double «reflection – «reflection-in-action» and «reflection-on-action» [16]. The concept of reflective practice developed by Donald A. Sch n has become one of the most influential approaches in understanding professional development in education. In his work *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (1983), he proposed a fundamentally new way of understanding professionalism – not as a set of formal competencies or knowledge, but as the ability to act consciously, adaptively, and critically in conditions of uncertainty, complexity, and the dynamics of practice [16].

One of the central concepts in Sch n's model is the dual structure of reflection, which encompasses:

– Reflection-in-action is the ability to think and adjust one's actions while they are being carried out. It refers to situations when a specialist encounters unpredictability or the uniqueness of a particular situation and does not have time for a thorough analysis. In such cases, he relies on professional intuition and instinct, but at the same time, he actively analyses and reflects on what is happening to make a prompt yet balanced decision.

– Reflection-on-action is the analysis of events that have already occurred, with the aim of evaluating decisions and outcomes and finding ways to improve practice in the future. This type of reflection, according to Sch n, allows for the transformation of experience into knowledge, creating a foundation for conscious professional growth.

Such a distinction has profound pedagogical significance. In the context of teaching activities, «reflection in action» allows, for example, changing the course of a lesson, adapting explanations to students' reactions, or rethinking the use of a resource or task in real time. This is a sign of flexible pedagogical presence that is not limited to a pre-planned script. Instead, «reflection after action» is already a stage of deep analysis: what was successful? What needs improvement? How did changes in the pedagogical approach affect student understanding, motivation, or engagement?

Sch n emphasised that in conditions where professional practice is not reduced to the routine application of templates (which is especially relevant for higher education teaching), reflection becomes a means of navigating «ambiguous, non-standard, and contradictory» situations [16]. Pedagogical reality is often just like that: student groups of varying levels, ambiguous motivation, cultural or social differences, the implementation of digital tools, etc. In such conditions, only those educators who possess the reflective ability to not only analyse but also act based on this analysis during the interaction itself can operate effectively.

Thus, Sch n does not oppose reflection and action, as the traditional technocratic model of professionalism does. On the contrary, he argues that reflection is an internal component of action when that action is performed with an awareness of its context, goals, and possible alternatives. In his interpretation, a specialist is a «thinker-in-action,» not just an executor following a predetermined algorithm.

In this regard, Sch n's ideas fully resonate with the updated philosophy of the UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF, 2023), particularly in the section concerning the continuous improvement of teaching practice through section A5 («enhance practice through own continuing professional development»). The Framework views professional development not as a staged event (seminar, course, certificate), but as a continuous cycle of reflective activity integrated into the daily practice of the educator. This directly aligns with Sch n's approach, where learning occurs through «reflection in action,» rather than solely in the format of formalised post-action analysis.

Moreover, the UKPSF supports the principle of evidence-informed reflection, where critical reflection on practice should be based not only on subjective experience but also on data: learning outcomes, student feedback, peer observation, etc. Such an approach expands Sean's concept by adding an institutional dimension and enhancing the significance of reflection as a professional standard.

Overall, the application of Sch n's model within the UKPSF framework allows us to speak of reflection as a form of high-level pedagogical thinking that combines intuition, theoretical understanding, and dynamic adaptability. Such an approach creates

conditions for the transition from reactive teaching to conscious professional leadership both in and out of the classroom.

The Four Lenses of Critical Pedagogy: Brookfield's Reflective Model.

Building on this foundation, the work of Stephen D. Brookfield further deepens the reflective paradigm by offering a practical, structured methodology for critical self-inquiry. While Schön outlines the conceptual duality of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, Brookfield operationalises reflection through a four-lens model that guides educators toward a more comprehensive, inclusive, and critical analysis of their teaching practice. The detailing of Stephen D. Brookfield's reflective approach, one of the most influential researchers in critical pedagogy, offers a systematic, essential model of reflection based on four «lenses»: the educator's own experience, students' experience, peer observation, and analysis of scholarly literature [8, pp. 61–78]. This approach provides a multidimensional understanding of pedagogical activity, allowing one to go beyond subjective interpretation and creating conditions for objective, evidence-based, and contextually sensitive improvement of teaching practice.

1. Personal lens (autobiographical lens). This dimension of reflection is based on the instructor's awareness of their own values, beliefs, experiences, and emotions that influence their teaching. According to Brookfield, personal reflection is an entry point to deeper self-awareness: «Understanding how I teach depends on understanding who I am as a teacher» [8]. In the context of the UKPSE, this lens directly relates to professional values (V1 – V5), particularly V3 – the use of scholarly approaches to one's own practice – and V5 – collaboration for improvement. Personal reflection helps to critically assess how well one's pedagogical beliefs align with professional requirements, ethics, and the expectations of the educational environment [3, p. 4].

2. Student lens (learners' eyes) Learners' eyes. The perspective of students is one of the most powerful sources of feedback, allowing the instructor to see the effectiveness of their activities through the eyes of those they are aimed at. Brookfield emphasises: «We may think our methods are working, but only through students' perceptions can

we find out if they really are» [8, p. 64]. This is related to the areas of activity A3 (assessment and feedback) and A4 (support for students) within the UKPSF framework [3, p. 5]. The student lens allows for a deeper understanding of which aspects of the learning environment facilitate or hinder learning and which pedagogical approaches are most effective in this context.

3. Collegial lens (colleagues' perceptions). Colleagues as a source of reflective information play a key role in shaping a culture of openness, mutual learning, and professional growth. Observing each other's teaching, participating in mentoring, or joint planning are not only mechanisms for improvement but also forms of professional support. In the context of the UKPSF, this is directly reflected in A5 (professional development) and V5 (collaboration with others to enhance practice) [3, pp. 4–5]. Brookfield emphasises that it is precisely in collegial dialogue that a critical assessment of the «blind spots» in one's own teaching is possible – those aspects that cannot be seen independently [8].

4. Scientific lens (theoretical literature). The analysis of professional literature allows not only for comparing one's own approaches with widely accepted ones but also for critically reviewing educational practices, reinforcing or changing them based on research. This dimension forms the cognitive foundation for pedagogical activity – what is described in the UKPSF as Core Knowledge K3: critical evaluation as a basis for effective practice [3, p. 4]. It contributes not only to justifying actions but also to forming a strategy for improving practice based on best evidence-based practices.

Thus, Brookfield's four-lenses model provides the educator with a comprehensive system of self-reflection and improvement, based on a multi-source analysis of their own activities. Its structure fully aligns with the logic of the UK Professional Standards Framework (2023), complementing and deepening the requirements for professional values, knowledge, and areas of activity for educators. Such an approach allows for the formation of not only a reflective but also an ethically responsible and educationally mature professional.

After a detailed analysis of conceptual models of reflective practice – specifically the approaches of Donald Schön [16] and Stephen Brookfield [8] – it is logical to transition to a critical

examination of the practical dimensions of teaching activities, which are central to the implementation of the updated UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF, 2023) [3]. The focus of this analysis is on assessment as a development tool, the use of digital technologies, engaging students as partners, and reorganising the educational environment as a space for reflective, socially orientated learning.

Reflection in Practice: Assessment, Technology, Student Partnership. Reflective assessment as a mechanism for forming self-regulated learning and professional maturity of the teacher. One of the key indicators of the transition from traditional pedagogy to reflective practice is the transformation in the field of assessment. If previous assessments primarily served a control function, modern didactics views them as a means of learning and development. According to the formative assessment model proposed by Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick, effective feedback should be timely, specific, dialogic, and conducive to the development of self-reflection and self-correction abilities in students [15]. Such assessment stimulates the growth of metacognitive skills and fosters a culture of responsibility for one's own learning.

At the same time, as Adcroft rightly notes, feedback that is not accompanied by pedagogical reflection, from both the instructor and the student, can turn into a ritualised process that does not generate educational value [1]. Such criticism is highly relevant in the context of the UKPSF, where component A3 (assessment and feedback) is intrinsically linked to A5 (professional development) and V3 (evidence-based practice) [3].

Considering this, the concept of constructive alignment by Biggs and Tang, which involves the integration of objectives, content, methods, and assessment into a single logical system, is pedagogically valuable [6]. Such alignment ensures the integrity of the instructional design and enhances its effectiveness. In turn, Blochsem and Boyd emphasise the importance of authentic assessment, which should not only be content-relevant but also transparent, inclusive, and comprehensible for the student [7].

Digitalisation of teaching: between technological progress and pedagogical responsibility dynamic digital transformation changes not only the tools of teaching but also the very pedagogical logic. Digital

platforms, learning analytics, adaptive technologies, and generative artificial intelligence are changing the nature of teaching presence. However, as Farrell notes, the integration of digital tools should be based not on technological enthusiasm but on pedagogical justification: «first content and purpose, then form and means» [9].

A notable example of the combination of innovation and ethics is the University of Leicester's policy on generative AI, which emphasises the necessity of ensuring academic integrity and critical pedagogical reflection [17]. In this context, digital tools are viewed not as a replacement for the instructor but as an extension of their capabilities, which should be integrated into a structured, reflective pedagogical strategy in accordance with the UKPSF requirements (especially A5 and V4) [3].

Partnership with Students: The Evolution of Roles in the Learning Process

One of the most significant changes in contemporary university teaching is the rethinking of the student's role – from a passive consumer of knowledge to an active co-creator of the learning process. This transformation is clearly outlined in the works of Gilly, Matthews, and Cook-Sather, who justify the concept of educational partnership, in which the student has a real influence on the content, methods, and assessment [10].

In this context, Hermann's work is also relevant, as it demonstrates how tutoring formats of education contribute to the development of cognitive independence, confidence, and critical thinking [11]. Balwant and Duon, in turn, emphasise that alternative, adaptive formats of mentoring support better meet the needs of students in various sociocultural contexts [4]. All these ideas directly resonate with V1 – V2 UKPSF (respect for individual characteristics and engagement in learning) and A4 (student support) [3].

The educational environment as a space for reflection, social interaction, and critical thinking Modern pedagogy recognises that quality learning is not limited to content or methodology but largely depends on the organisation of the educational environment itself. In their model of «two-cycle» experience, Bergsteiner and Avery emphasise the repetition of experience and reflection as the key mechanism for transferring knowledge to new situations [5]. This

involves creating educational contexts in which students can practice reflection, make mistakes, receive support, and rethink their experiences.

The ideas of social learning by Lave and Wenger, who interpret learning as a form of participation in «communities of practice,» where knowledge is born in interaction, are also fundamental for understanding pedagogical reality as a social construct [14]. Here, the instructor becomes a facilitator of interaction, rather than the sole source of truth. This model is extremely close to the values of the UKPSF (V5: collaboration; K1 – K2: understanding the learning process and appropriate methods) [3].

Critical thinking as a result and method of this process, according to bell hooks, is not merely a cognitive function – it is also an act of resistance, an ethical choice, and social awareness [12]. In an educational environment that supports such a paradigm, critical thinking is not imposed but grows from the experience of dialogue, partnership, and reflection.

Institutional support: forming a collective culture of reflection and innovation

The professional growth of a teacher cannot be considered in isolation from the institutional context. As Ketteridge, Marshall, and Fry indicate, it is institutional policy that determines whether reflective teaching will be supported and encouraged [13]. Professional development, mentorship, facilitation of inter-faculty exchange, and inclusive learning design are necessary prerequisites for the practical implementation of the UKPSF as a systemic framework for educational quality.

UKPSF 2023 provides for such institutional responsibility, particularly through the combination of individual professional development with institutional standards (see A5, V4, V5). This means that a lecturer who practices reflection not only improves themselves but also influences the change in the academic culture at the university.

Conclusions. The conducted research has demonstrated that the updated version of the UK Professional Standards Framework (2023) emerges as a holistic methodological tool that represents a new paradigm of pedagogical professionalisation in higher education. Unlike the normative-functional approach, which is solely focused

on the standardisation of educational activities, the UKPSF offers a complex multidimensional model, at the centre of which is reflective practice as a leading value, a means of professional development, and a mechanism for the ethical commitment of the educator. One of the key theoretical results of the research was the confirmation that reflection – both in its classical dual understanding by Donald Schön (reflection-in-action / reflection-on-action) and in the context of critical self-assessment according to the four lenses model by S. Brookfield – is not just a tool for improving pedagogical technique but a way of conceptually rethinking the role of the instructor in the modern academic environment. This means that reflection is not limited to self-observation but serves to comprehend professional identity, interaction with students, and ethical challenges that arise in daily pedagogical practice.

The article argues that the structure of the UKPSF – professional values, core knowledge, areas of activity – not only aligns teaching practice with institutional expectations but also transforms it into a field of continuous self-reflective improvement. Importance is attached to component A5 (enhancing one's practice through professional development), which institutionalises the idea of continuous teacher learning integrated into the daily educational process. In this context, professional development takes on the character of an internal need to constantly rethink and improve one's actions based on evidence, feedback, theoretical sources, and contextual changes, rather than external coercion (courses, certifications).

Particular attention should be paid to the analysis of the connection between reflective practice and key processes in modern higher education: formative assessment, student partnership, the use of digital technologies, and the transformation of the academic environment. It has been shown that reflection serves as the unifying element of these processes, ensuring pedagogical integrity, openness to change, and social sensitivity of the educator. Constructive alignment of goals, content, methods, and assessments demonstrated by B. Biggs's model is impossible without the reflective participation of the instructor at all stages of educational design.

In the context of Ukrainian higher education, the adaptation of UKPSF provisions has not only theoretical but also practical significance: it can contribute to the systemic renewal of teaching culture, the strengthening of academic integrity principles, the establishment of a student-centred approach, and the overall enhancement of the quality of the educational experience. It is not about the mechanical transfer of the Western model but about the productive correlation of its value and methodological foundations with national challenges and priorities. In this sense, the UKPSF can serve as a benchmark for forming a mature pedagogical community in Ukraine, guided not only by standards but primarily by responsibility, self-awareness, and a culture of continuous improvement.

Therefore, the research results confirm that reflection within the UKPSF framework emerges not as a tool but as a form of pedagogical existence – one that connects practice with ethics, action with thinking, and teaching with leadership.

Reference:

1. Adcroft, A. (2011). The Mythology of Feedback. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 30(4), 405–419. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2010.526096>
2. Advance HE. (2021). Reflective Practice Toolkit. Available at: <https://advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/reflection-learning-teaching>
3. Advance HE. (2023). The UK Professional Standards Framework (UKPSF). Available at: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf>
4. Balwant, P. T., & Doon, R. (2021). Alternatives to the conventional 'Oxford' tutorial model: a scoping review. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 18(1), 29. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00265-y>
5. Bergsteiner, H., & Avery, G. C. (2014). The twin cycle experiential learning model: reconceptualising Kolb's theory. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 36(3), 257–274. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2014.904782>
6. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education. Available at: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=798265>
7. Bloxham, S., & Boyd, P. (2007). *Developing effective assessment in higher education: a practical guide*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

- Available at: https://books.google.com/books/about/Developing_Effective_Assessment_In_Highe.html?id=d2ZNI0LHDIC
8. Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons. Chapter 4: The Four Lenses of Critical Reflection, pp. 61–78.
 9. Ferrell, G. (2018). Designing learning and assessment in a digital age – a new guide for higher and further education. *Jisc e-learning blog*, 29 January. Available at: <https://elearning.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2018/01/29/designing-learning-and-assessment-in-a-digital-age-new-guide-for-higher-and-further-education/>
 10. Healey, M., Matthews, K. E., & Cook-Sather, A. *Writing about Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Creating and Contributing to Scholarly Conversations across a Range of Genres*. Available at: <https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/books/writing-about-learning/>
 11. Herrmann, K. J. (2014). Learning from tutorials: A qualitative study of approaches to learning and perceptions of tutorial interaction. *Higher Education*, 68(4), 591–606. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9731-3>
 12. hooks, b. (2009). *Teaching critical thinking: practical wisdom*. Taylor & Francis Group. Available at: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=452100>
 13. Ketteridge, S., Marshall, S., & Fry, H. (ред.) (2014). *A handbook for teaching and learning in higher education: enhancing academic practice*. 4th ed. London: Taylor & Francis Group. Available at: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=1770537>
 14. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
 15. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: a model and seven principles of good feedback practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
 16. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books. Available at: <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9781315237473/reflective-practitioner-donald-sch%C3%B6n>
 17. University of Leicester. (2024). *Policy on Generative Artificial Intelligence in Learning, Teaching and Assessment*. Available at: <https://le.ac.uk/policies/quality#:~:text=Policy%20on%20Generative%20Artificial%20Intelligence%20in%20Learning%2c%20Teaching%20and%20Assessment>

Список використаних джерел :

1. Adcroft, A. (2011). Міфологія зворотного зв'язку. *Наукові дослідження та розвиток у вищій освіті*, 30(4), 405–419. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2010.526096>
2. Advance HE. (2021). *Інструментарій рефлексивної практики (Reflective Practice Toolkit)*. URL: <https://advance-he.ac.uk/news-and-views/reflection-learning-teaching>
3. Advance HE. (2023). *Рамкова модель професійних стандартів Великої Британії (UKPSF)*. URL: <https://www.advance-he.ac.uk/guidance/teaching-and-learning/ukpsf>
4. Balwant, P. T., & Doon, R. (2021). Альтернативи традиційній моделі «Оксфордського» тьюторіалу: огляд літератури. *Міжнародний журнал освітніх технологій у вищій освіті*, 18(1), 29. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-021-00265-y>
5. Bergsteiner, H., & Avery, G. C. (2014). Подвійна модель досвідного навчання: переосмислення теорії Колба. *Безперервна освіта: дослідження*, 36(3), 257–274. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2014.904782>
6. Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2011). *Навчання для забезпечення якості у вищій освіті* (4-е вид.). McGraw-Hill Education. URL: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=798265>
7. Bloxham, S., & Boyd, P. (2007). *Розробка ефективного оцінювання у вищій освіті: практичний посібник*. Maidenhead: OpenUniversityPress. URL: https://books.google.com/books/about/Developing_Effective_Assessment_In_Highe.html?id=d2ZNIIm0LHDIC
8. Brookfield, S. D. (2017). *Стаючи критично-рефлексивним викладачем* (2-е вид.). John Wiley & Sons. Розділ 4: Чотири лінзи критичної рефлексії, с. 61–78.
9. Ferrell, G. (2018). Проектування навчання та оцінювання в цифрову епоху Новий посібник для вищої та професійної освіти. *Блог Jisce-learning*, 29 січня. URL: <https://elearning.jiscinvolve.org/wp/2018/01/29/designing-learning-and-assessment-in-a-digital-age-new-guide-for-higher-and-further-education/>
10. Healey, M., Matthews, K. E., & Cook-Sather, A. *Писання про навчання і викладання у вищій освіті: участь у наукових дискусіях у різних жанрах*. URL: <https://www.centerforengagedlearning.org/books/writing-about-learning/>
11. Herrmann, K. J. (2014). Навчання за допомогою тьюторіалів: якісне дослідження підходів до навчання та сприйняття тьюторіальної взаємодії. *Вища освіта*, 68(4), 591–606. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-014-9731-3>

12. Hooks, b. (2009). *Навчання критичному мисленню: практична мудрість*. Taylor&FrancisGroup. URL: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=452100>
13. Ketteridge, S., Marshall, S., & Fry, H. (Eds.) (2014). *Посібник з викладання та навчання у вищій освіті: підвищення академічної практики (4-е вид.)*. London: Taylor&FrancisGroup. URL: <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/leicester/detail.action?docID=1770537>
14. Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Ситуативне навчання: легітимна периферійна участь*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
15. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Формативне оцінювання та саморегульоване навчання: модель і сім принципів якісного фідбеку. *Studies in Higher Education*, 31(2), 199–218. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090>
16. Sch n, D. A. (1983). *Рефлексивний практик: як професіонали мислять у дії*. New York: Basic Books.
17. University of Leicester. (2024). *Політика щодо генеративного штучного інтелекту у навчанні, викладанні та оцінюванні*. URL: <https://le.ac.uk/policies/quality#:~:text=Policy%20on%20Generative%20Artificial%20Intelligence%20in%20Learning%2c%20Teaching%20and%20Assessment>

І. В. Костенко

Інтеграція професійних стандартів Великої Британії 2023 у педагогічну практику вищої освіти : шлях до рефлексивного викладання

Анотація. Стаття присвячена критичному аналізу потенціалу впровадження оновленої Рамкової моделі професійних стандартів викладання і підтримки навчання у вищій освіті Великої Британії (UKPSF, 2023) як складного педагогічного конструкту, що виходить за межі інструментального підходу до викладання та формує цілісну методологію рефлексивного професіоналізму. Здійснено поглиблене осмислення теоретичних засад педагогічної рефлексії в контексті сучасної вищої освіти, зокрема через призму подвійної моделі рефлексії Дональда Шона (рефлексія в дії / після дії) та чотирьох лінз критичної самооцінки за Стівеном Брукфілдом, що дозволяє розглядати професійну діяльність викладача як простір системного переосмислення, співдії та критичного діалогу з освітнім середовищем.

У центрі уваги – структурно-функціональна модель UKPSF, що поєднує три взаємозалежні компоненти: професійні цінності, ядрові знання

та сфери діяльності. Аналіз демонструє, що ефективне застосування цієї рамки передбачає глибоке внутрішнє узгодження між педагогічними переконаннями викладача, його здатністю до самоаналізу, взаємодією з учасниками освітнього процесу та контекстуальними змінами в академічному полі. Особливе місце відведено компоненту А5 – удосконаленню педагогічної практики через безперервний професійний розвиток, який трактується не як технічна процедура, а як етично обґрунтований і контекстно вмотивований процес становлення освітнього лідера.

У статті також обґрунтовано, що рефлексивна педагогіка не може бути ізольованим внутрішнім актом викладача, а є соціальним, інтерсуб'єктивним процесом, який передбачає врахування студентського голосу, колегіального досвіду, інституційних рамок і академічної політики. У цьому контексті UKPSF репрезентує не лише нормативний орієнтир, а й ціннісну модель формування культури академічної доброчесності, критичного мислення, діалогічної взаємодії та соціальної відповідальності у вищій школі.

Методологічно дослідження побудоване на засадах інтерпретативного підходу з елементами якісного аналізу, компаративної педагогіки, теоретичного моделювання та кейс-стаді. Така стратегія дозволяє комплексно виявити потенціал UKPSF як інструмента педагогічної трансформації у відповідь на виклики цифровізації, зміну студентських ролей, глобалізацію знання та потребу у філософськи вмотивованому, а не технократичному баченні професійної освітньої діяльності.

Ключові слова: UKPSF 2023; рефлексивна педагогіка; критична рефлексія; професійна ідентичність викладача; педагогічна етика; студентське партнерство; академічна доброчесність; цифровізація освіти; професіоналізація викладання; розвиток вищої освіти.