

e-mentor

DWUMIESIĘCZNIK SZKOŁY GŁÓWNEJ HANDLOWEJ W WARSZAWIE
WSPÓŁWYDAWCA: FUNDACJA PROMOCJI I AKREDYTACJI KIERUNKÓW EKONOMICZNYCH

2026, nr 2 (114)



Czyżewska, M., & Lejzerowicz, M. (2026). Communities of practice at the Maria Grzegorzewska University: Academic teachers' and trainers' perspectives. *e-mentor*, 2(114), 23–29. <https://www.doi.org/10.15219/em114.1749>

Copyright © 2026, Czyżewska Monika, Lejzerowicz Magda



Monika
Czyżewska

Magda
Lejzerowicz

Communities of Practice at the Maria Grzegorzewska University: Academic Teachers' and Trainers' Perspectives

Abstract

This article explores how two institutional innovations implemented at the Maria Grzegorzewska University – the 'Masters of Didactics' tutoring programme and the 'Learning and Development Centre' training programme – have contributed to the emergence of communities of practice, particularly in training activities related to support for students with special needs. The study aimed to examine the relationship between the introduction of tutoring methods at the university, the implementation of specialised training for tutors, academic staff, and administrative employees, and the development of a collaborative academic culture. The research applied a qualitative, survey-based approach using an evaluation study design. Data were collected in early and late spring 2023 from 40 participants (both trainees and trainers) through open-ended questionnaires focused on educational adjustment and well-being at work. The findings indicate that the changes initiated by the tutoring programme and continued by the Learning and Development Centre trainings led to the emergence of a new culture of professional relations, increased collaboration, and subsequently to the creation of communities of practice among the University employees. These developments were particularly visible in areas related to accessibility and the support of diverse student needs. There is one unexpected educational added value: topics concerning students' special needs allowed the academic and administrative staff to talk about their own special needs. Although the Learning and Development Centre trainings primarily focused on educational accessibility for students, they were highly interactive and workshop-based, requiring academics and administrative staff to co-create solutions together. Through this collaborative action, a genuine community of practice began to emerge, which we could 'observe' in the responses of the participants at the final phase of the survey.

Keywords: higher education, tutoring, communities of practice, university teaching excellence centre, special needs

Introduction

The theoretical framework for categories used in this text is the social theory of learning. The underlying logic of communities of practice shares much with notions of learning communities. The concept of communities of practice emerged earlier than learning communities as a form of educational practice and programming – particularly in the United States – although not always under that specific name. In the 1960s and early 1970s, universities experimented with collaborative student learning models, such as integrated curricula, team-taught courses, and residential learning arrangements where students lived and studied together. Learning communities originated as innovative pedagogical approaches and only later became the subject of theoretical interest. In parallel, but independently, Jean Lave and Étienne Wenger (1991) introduced the concept of communities of practice. Their work provided the first formal definition of communities of practice within the framework of situated learning theory, which emphasised learning through participation in social practices. Wenger further elaborated the concept (1998). He enumerated the conditions that should be met in order for a given group of workers to be called an established community of practice: when there is (1) a common domain (interest), (2) a community (a group of collaborat-

ing people) and (3) a common practice in this domain (Wenger, 1998). This model has been widely applied in academic contexts, especially in analysing how university staff collaborate, share expertise, and co-create institutional cultures.

A related and similarly influential concept – the learning organisation – was proposed by Peter Senge (1991). Although developed independently from communities of practice theory, Senge's idea highlights the role of informal and collective learning processes within organisational settings, aligning with key principles of both communities of practice and learning communities.

The notions of communities of practice and learning communities also resonate with the concept of empowerment – understood here as a continuous process of enabling participants to become emancipated agents of educational processes, capable of discovering and realising their own potential (Hashmi, 2014; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Historically, the term community was first introduced into sociology and the social sciences by Ferdinand Tönnies in 1887 (2001). Over time and in the context of working and educational settings, in the form of learning communities and communities of practice, the concept has evolved in response to social changes. Today, it offers a meaningful counterbalance to the pressures of mass university education, the atomization of social life, and the dominance of individualistic culture.

Another issue that complements the topic of building a community at the university is the extent of cooperation between teaching staff and students, which expresses the level of organisational academic culture. To achieve the goal of collaborative culture at the university, several conditions should be fulfilled: there is a necessity (1) for students to be agents in their process of learning with support from tutors, (2) of establishing cooperation between academics and students with the active participation of the latter, who could autonomously decide about directions of their tutoring process (Lejzerowicz & Podstawka, 2021), (3) of making tutoring a work method with students with special educational needs, gifted students, but with some barriers, who need support and personalized approach (Dziedziczak-Foltyn et al., 2020).

Institutional Innovations at Maria Grzegorzewska University: Tutoring and The Learning and Development Centre

In many countries for decades, and in Poland only for a few years (enabled by EU-funded programmes launched in 2018), large-scale activities aimed at improving the quality of teaching and assessment have been carried out. At The Maria Grzegorzewska

University (MGU), there were two programmes financed within this programme: 'The Masters of Didactics' (2020–2022) and 'Excellence in Didactics' (2022–2023), which enabled the MGU to accelerate the process of teaching excellence. Before these projects were fully developed, there was a recognized (via surveys) need 1) to strengthen the existence of cooperation between the MGU employees (researchers, teachers, administrative staff) and support its quality based on trust; 2) to inspire small teams of mutually supportive colleagues who would share knowledge, and both of these directions would allow members of the institution's community to identify with the mission of the MGU (Czyżewska et al., 2022), according to the belief that the better well-being, the better education. The mission of the University is to provide opportunities for development and use of participants' potential in educational processes by realising it within the institution.

Knowledge sharing in the form of collaborative learning (called 'team learning' in Peter Senge's terminology¹) is a unique opportunity to solve problems that cannot be solved by one person alone. A university operating on such a foundation becomes a learning organisation (Senge, 1991) – one that uses the richness of bottom-up processes to improve the culture of dialogue by taking advantage of the human need for interaction. Some of these processes at the MGU began with the introduction of the tutoring method.

Based on solutions popularized in the cradle of tutoring work, Oxford University, where work with an individual student (or with a group of up to 4 students) takes various forms, such as tutorials with a tutor or a fellow, meetings with the director of studies, at the MGU the following formula has been used: developmental tutoring, academic (scientific) tutoring, blended (developmental and scientific) tutoring, and peer tutoring (amongst teachers), in a group of 4 (up to 8) persons.

Tutoring as part of the study programme was introduced at the MGU in 2020. However, about 7 years earlier, some teachers, on their own and unofficially, introduced some elements of that type of method. Only a few groups had the opportunity to work this way. The supervisor of one of the groups was Magda Lejzerowicz – the co-author of the article, and this example can be representative. The group was born out of Disability Studies classes. When the course started, the participants had a long discussion about how and on what topic they would want to work. The decision was made by the majority of the participants and also the moderator. They started working in the form of scientific tutoring. One of the results of the tutoring work was a publication of the article 'Accessibility in culture – a participatory perspective' (Ciechomska et al., 2022).

¹ Four other from all five disciplines named by Peter Senge are: shared vision, mental models, personal mastery and systems thinking (Senge, 1991).

Officially, tutoring in the shape of a 3–5 semester programme „Masters of Didactics’ (which first phase meant training of 30 selected teachers in the field of teaching and instruction at 5 European universities and then granting them a tutor’s certificate) started in spring 2020 and was financed by the Polish Government – the Ministry of Education and Science. In the second phase, there were one-on-one tutorials with students. All participants were invited to join freely, but under certain conditions. During the first year of this practice, the programme was joined by 20 certified tutors and 75 tutees, chosen according to the principles agreed in the contract with the Ministry. In the second year (Autumn 2021), 30 tutors and 112 tutees participated in the programme. The programme lasted till the end of 2022. Such examples of good practice encouraged the authorities of the MGU to continue the course towards implementing tutoring into its curricula.

A further step in teaching improvement at MGU emerged from bottom-up initiatives led by tutoring programme participants. Their activities led to the Rector’s decision to establish a university-wide teaching excellence unit, a kind of university teaching excellence centre, whose purpose would be supporting and improving academic teachers’ competences, with a further and long-term aim of making students responsible for their own learning process. In other words, to enable both groups to engage in self-regulated learning and functioning at work. The Learning and Development Centre (LDC) was founded in Autumn 2022.

The Learning and Development Centre’s First Training Project

The LDC won a public grant for organising intensive training for teachers, tutors and administrative staff (who play a crucial role in the delivery of a high-quality educational process). The LDC’s leaders were conscious of the notion of ‘learning communities’ and the design work was directed in such a way that the features and manifestations of behaviour mentioned by Senge (1991) and Wenger (1998) could emerge and develop within teachers and administrative staff of the MGU. The idea of the project for a participant (who might be a tutor, an academic teacher or an administrative employee) was to connect with another participant and create a so-called ‘dyad’, which was intended to be the starting point for all subsequent project activities, alongside the far-sighted aim of initiating and establishing communities of practice: accompanying each other in classes (or in other daily activities) and then providing feedback (of the supporting type, on demand), conducting ‘developmental conversations’ based on the peer mentoring model, providing mutual assistance and advice on all next steps of the project. In order to examine the needs of teaching and administrative employees, a staff needs study was carried out, which included pre-training analyses to select the desired subject

areas and adapt the final design of the training programme to them. The chosen topics of training and workshops included the following topics and their subthemes:

Teaching methods:

- Academic mentoring,
- Activating methods of learning and cooperation in a class group,
- Feedback in the university – towards dialogue and attentiveness,
- Jigsaw method in didactic work,
- Oxford debate,
- Peer tutoring and peer instruction methods,
- Supervision of the teaching process,
- Supervision of the tutoring process.

Diversity:

- Accessibility in teaching and in administrative service process,
- Diverse needs of students and staff,
- Gender equality policy in HE,
- Inclusive design.

Well-being and sustainability:

- Activating empathy in case studies – a proposal for imaginative work,
- Activating methods and methods with elements of the project method in academic practice, i.e. ‘how to work with students so that they not only believe they have wings, but also have the courage to fly’,
- Application of Non-Violent Communication (NVC) and Solution-Focused Brief Approach (SFBA) in HE,
- Integrating sustainability goals into teaching/tutoring processes,
- Quality of narration and quality of life – from content to making sense, i.e. writing for health,
- Relaxation as an antidote to professional burn-out.

Office work development:

- Basics of using a spreadsheet in office work,
- The Planner Programme introduction – a specialised course for administrative staff.

Human resources:

- Development of teaching staff,
- The ‘teal management’ principles in HE.

Teaching technologies:

- Opportunities and risks of using ChatGPT in education: seminar and practical workshop.

We asked participants and trainers of the above-mentioned workshops and trainings to take part in an evaluation survey on educational adjustment. Educational adjustment in this study is defined as achieving an inclusive environment which requires creating spaces and programmes that accommodate and meet the needs of students with diverse needs, including those with disabilities. Implementing adjustments can help remove barriers and promote equitable participation at university for all students and staff (International Finance Corporation, 2024).

Data obtained from this survey are the subject of analysis in this study. After trainings and workshops the dyads were given the opportunity to participate in 4-hour supervisions (during their work and at the end of that process), which were aimed at helping participants look at how they work, whether there is a balance of power, what areas require special attention in the dyad, and what development tasks arise for each person thanks to this – unusual in the academic environment – form of cooperation.

Studies show that inclusive education is intertwined with learning communities through shared principles such as collaboration, diversity, participation (or engagement) of all stakeholders, and reflective practices that aim to improve educational outcomes (Solis-Grant et al., 2023). Inclusive HE involves collective efforts within learning communities to address diverse student needs through various strategies, including different types of assessment, motivational techniques, and environments that value diversity and accessibility.

Methodological Aspects of the Research

The aim of the research was to examine the connection between the introduction of two teaching innovations (i.e., the tutoring programme and the LDC with its training programme provided to tutors, academics and administrative staff) and the emergence of communities of practice. A research problem was formulated: What is the relationship between the implementation of the tutoring programme at a university, the delivery of specialised training by the LDC to tutors, academics, and administrative staff, and the subsequent formation and sustenance of communities of practice?

The research material used for the analysis consisted of data from a two-fold diagnostic evaluation study conducted in early (initial evaluation) and late spring of 2023 (follow-up evaluation) among trainees and trainers (1) on their perception of the concept and practice of educational adjustment, and (2) on the level of their well-being at work, which was examined here as a relational aspect of the outcome of professional support and institutional accessibility. Well-being in this study is defined not only as 'feeling good', but also as belonging to a support group (community of teachers or administrative employees).

In the initial survey, future 40 participants of the training in the process of teaching and administrative services were asked several open questions (in the form of online surveys) regarding self-assessment of their own teaching, their attitude to tutoring method, their expectations towards the quality of interpersonal relationships within their colleagues, their own needs as teachers and their assumptions regarding students, their understanding of the concept of 'accessibility' and perceived difficulties in teaching and administrative work related to own and others' special needs.

Similarly, after the training, participants were asked to fill in a follow-up survey – two months after

the initial survey. An online questionnaire was sent with open-ended questions, including: What are your reflections after the training? Which of your needs expressed before the training were met? How did you improve your skills in inclusive design? Which elements of the training do you intend to implement in your work? How have you engaged so far, and how would you like to engage in the future within the University community?

Thematic Analysis of Qualitative Data

To investigate the specific impact and interplay of professional development trainings conducted by the LDC on the development of a 'cohesive learning community' within the MGU community, we employed a qualitative approach. To analyse the data from the open-ended question responses collected during the initial and final survey phases, we used thematic analysis, based on the method framework developed by Braun and Clarke (2026). Its reflexive direction seemed most appropriate to the research issues we addressed in our study – identification of core themes within the participants' reflections, the changing nature of their attitudes to certain areas during the whole process of the study and the evaluation of the whole project assumptions.

Results

Based on the analysis of the initial survey results conducted with training participants, the data were identified, analysed, and meanings emerging from these responses were captured. Results were grouped into logical areas, and a number of themes appeared: needs, competencies, community building, well-being. The most frequently reported needs concerned: addressing the diverse needs of students. One of the study participants described his/her needs with questions: 'How can I use the potential that comes from the diversity of people in the group? How can I adapt tasks/forms of assessment to a diverse group? How can I engage a diverse group? Specific examples of proven solutions for a broadly defined diverse group would be valuable' (Respondent No. 1); understanding academic *savoir-vivre* in relation to individuals with special needs: 'How can I work with people in gender transition?' (Respondent No. 2), 'I believe that competencies related to openness, a willingness to help, understanding the problem, and empathy would be very important to me. I think these are elements that would help me in my day-to-day work. Simply put, how to be 'accessible' to others, how to listen to others and respond' (Respondent No. 1); access to technical support. Respondent No. 4 indicated: 'What I find difficult is the unpredictability of what I'll find in the classroom, such as missing or non-functioning equipment (e.g., disconnected cables, a burned-out lamp in the projector, missing updates on the computer, etc.)' and, finally, the desire to connect with colleagues and share best practices from their own professional experience:

Communities of Practice at the Maria Grzegorzewska...

'There is often a lack of friendly cooperation with other departments. We need more openness to help from other departments. We need a better, more efficient flow of information' (Respondent No. 11).

Such declarations demonstrate shared responsibility for the quality of education, redefining the role of the employee as an active member of the community of practice. Understanding others' needs improved organisational culture (well-being). The opportunity to exchange challenging professional experiences and the sense of not being alone with pedagogical difficulties directly translated into the participants' workplace well-being, making them feel more confident and institutionally supported. It left them with a reassuring notion that they know where to seek for help and answers, even to awkward questions.

The analysis of the follow-up survey results revealed several competences and elements of the training that participants intend to incorporate into their professional practice. These include enhanced sensitivity to their own needs and those of their students – manifested through efforts to gather information about students' expectations (e.g., using surveys or collaborative assignments). One of the respondents wrote that he/she is going 'to adapt presentations and asking open-ended questions about students' needs' (Respondent No. 9). Another one noticed, 'I realise after the workshop that it's not always possible to fully meet all needs or prepare materials that are 100 per cent universally accessible. I am going to avoid falling into a routine when preparing materials for students, ask them more frequently about their needs in this regard, and cultivate mindfulness and sensitivity to the needs of others' (Respondent No. 11) and adjusting both materials and the format of learning activities accordingly: 'I have got competency in the field of communication with students, for example how to ask students about their needs regarding the adaptation of course materials, as well as (to the extent possible) the format of classes (e.g., regarding breaks, etc.)' (Respondent No. 11).

Participants also emphasized the importance of developing effective communication skills 'I learned how to talk to people with various disabilities, how to behave in different situations, and how to calm someone who is having, for example, a panic attack. I found out that my colleagues from other departments had similar experiences' (Respondent No. 22) greater understanding: 'I introduce good, friendly communication in the employee-manager relationship, and I take advantage of the good advice from my colleagues who have been working here for a long time' (Respondent No. 4), and empathy toward individuals with diverse needs: 'I started asking students about their needs using a form (e.g., as an assignment in Teams)' (Respondent No. 10).

Proposed adjustments included improving the readability of presentations, ensuring accessible publication formats, choosing fonts that support readability, and providing support to students' individual needs and limitations in administrative issues: 'I think another important effect of the workshop is giving workers the possibility to meet, discuss, and

share their problems' (Respondent No. 22), 'I try to be mindful – I mentioned this in my summary – and take a personalized approach. I've come to realise that there's nothing to be afraid of when it comes to creating accessibility, so I ask my students and colleagues – because some know exactly how they want to be treated, while others have diverse experiences and great ideas. And also, I get to work with amazing people :)' (Respondent No. 8), 'In my work, I apply the knowledge I've gained about creating presentations and showing consideration for people who face challenges related to autism' (Respondent No. 4).

The experience of cooperative problem-solving in accessibility (educational adjustments) has become the foundation of common practice, which, according to Wenger's theory, is a condition for the creation of communities of practice. It was precisely this exchange of experiences and the shared challenge of addressing similar issues – whether administrative or related to teaching – that allowed participants to engage with one another. Through collaborative problem-solving, participants ceased to be merely individual recipients of procedures and became members of a supportive academic community. This transformation of individual emotions and experiences into a network of mutual support constitutes key evidence of the formation of a stable community. The proposed technical and administrative changes represent a form of reification – giving experiences and empathy the form of concrete tools or courses of action (Wenger, 1998).

Other post-training reflections indicated that the participants highly valued the opportunity to discuss the conduct of the classes to make them more inclusive and accessible. One of the respondents indicated that for him/her it was very important to get to know 'aspects related to adapting methods and formats in instructional classes for people with diverse needs' (Respondent No. 6). As a result, the need for adjustments in working with students with diverse needs was consistently observed.

One of the participants highlighted the added value of the training as the chance for in-depth discussions among peers, exchange of real-life experiences, all of which served as a valuable insight: 'the collaborative search for effective solutions, the Totupoint app, practical exercises on how to assist a blind person, the tour of the university, and the unforgettable look of surprise on the students' faces when they realized, 'The people from Student Affairs Office are getting trained, too!' (Respondent No. 22). Other participants appreciated the participatory concept of the training – especially the co-leading role of students, the practical approach to the topic, and the shared engagement which was important in assignments requiring effort in finding answers or solutions: 'The workshop on people on the autism spectrum was very valuable to me – I think it's fantastic that it was led by a student!!! That's how the academic community should function' (Respondent No. 8). 'The female students' involvement in co-leading the workshops, the practical approach to the topic, the intergenerational team' (Respondent

No. 22). A key aspect was also the openness and willingness to cooperate among participants: 'I'm really happy to be able to share my experience and learn from the experiences of others' (Respondent No. 3).

This intergenerational collaboration, which involves students as co-facilitators, serves as an excellent example of transcending the boundaries of traditional roles in academic culture, thereby redefining the participants' identities within the university community. The joint search for solutions (such as text-editing guidelines or the Totupoint app) expands the group's repertoire of activities, transforming theoretical knowledge into action-grounded practice. At the same time, acknowledging the need to take care of employees' well-being shows that negotiating meanings around accessibility involves not only technical procedures but also emotional costs and the limits of mutual engagement.

An unexpected yet significant outcome emerged from the analysis of two complementary initiatives explored in the study. Among the responses and during discussions about students' special needs, academic and administrative staff started to reflect on and share their own special needs. One of respondents wrote: 'I'll remember the conversations about my challenges as a teacher-educator and the exercise of putting myself in the shoes of people with various disabilities' (Respondent No. 1). This may be attributed to the personalized nature of these initiatives: the tutoring programme, grounded in one-on-one dialogue, and the LDC initiative, which was developed in response to the pre-training survey that captured participants' individual expectations and needs. The staff's discovery of their 'own needs' is key evidence of empowerment or emancipation – which was conceptualised as a manifestation of maturing into a community of practice in the theoretical introduction.

The results of the analyses showed convergence in the needs of all groups participating in the educational process at the higher education level. The needs related to the educational process design, adapting materials and the form of communication to the various needs of students and academic staff and administrative employees were reported by all surveyed trainees.

The results of the research confirm that the formation of learning communities was possible among academics of the MGU.

Summary

The goal of the first innovation, the Tutoring Programme, was to strengthen students' confidence in independent learning (a symptom of self-regulated learning) and to cultivate a culture of collaboration between academic teachers and students. Student success stories, such as increased participation in conferences, the founding of student-owned educational startups, and voluntary participation in research, emphasise the programme's positive impact. Our research confirms the crucial role of trust and collaboration (both making education more relationship-oriented) between tutors and students in achieving these outcomes.

Second innovation – the Learning and Development Centre organized intensive training for teachers and tutors, the purpose of which was to establish 'learning communities' of teachers (which focus on self-education groups and the supportive role of mutual feedback).

The results of the research show that the changes initiated by the tutoring programme and continued by the LDC have led to the emergence of a new culture of professional relations, manifested in new research and teaching initiatives, the creation of rules for cooperation and integration of the academic environment, and the creation of a 'learning community'.

The outcomes of our survey showed that people working at the MGU would like to get to know each other, cherish support and alliances, and would like to belong to what they call a 'supra-university community'.

Moreover, the unexpected result emerged from student engagement as co-trainers during the trainings, facilitating a deeper understanding of student perspectives and fostering cross-participant exchange. This student involvement has significantly contributed to improving the quality of education and work effectiveness.

An unexpected added value was that academic and administrative staff, while working during the training sessions on how to best adapt teaching and learning conditions for students, came to realise that they themselves have special needs. They discovered their own unique combinations of traits and challenges that also deserve recognition and support. Through exploring topics related to inclusion, MGU staff began to better understand their own situations – both as lecturers and as administrative professionals.

The outcomes of these programmes, which happened to be innovative for the MGU, highlight the establishment of strong teacher-student and teacher-teacher relationships, representing an investment in the Polish society in the broad sense: by nurturing tutor-tutee relations and promoting proactive student engagement, these initiatives counteract the devaluation of diplomas (which occurs due to massification of HE) and empower students to enter the job market with greater confidence and awareness of their strengths.

Another benefit was the inter-university nationwide tutoring network: the coordinator of the tutor team from the MGU invited coordinators from universities all over Poland – during the pandemic lockdown, representatives of several universities shared ideas on methods and literature, helped each other to understand organisational and financial issues, supported each other in grant-seeking for continuation of the tutoring programme.

According to Wenger's characteristics of communities of practice (1998), the community of the MGU has established one: we, the members of the community have shared common domain – it is the quality of higher education (teaching and learning); we belong to the same community which shares practice – our university staff, during the academic year 2022/23 shared time on excellence in teaching and on talking

about best teaching resources, varied experiences and problems that mattered teachers, tutors and administration. Through regular collaboration and shared experiences, participants have cultivated a vibrant community dedicated to continuous improvement in teaching excellence and professional development.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2024). *Analiza tematyczna. Praktyczny przewodnik* [Thematic analysis. A practical guide]. Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Ciechomska, M., Grabarczyk, D., Lejzerowicz, M., Nagler, J., Sawicka, J., & Surgiel, P. (2022). Dostępność w kulturze – perspektywa uczestnicząca [Accessibility in culture – a participatory perspective]. *Niepełnosprawność i Rehabilitacja*, 86(2), 18–32.
- Czyżewska, M., Duda, E., Perkowska-Klejman, & Zawadzka, E. (2022). Competences of academic tutors – research among participants of the project “Masters of Didactics”. *Quarterly Journal Fides et Ratio*, 50(2), 50–61. <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v50i2.966>
- Dziedziczak-Foltyn, A., Karpińska-Musiał, B., & Sar-nat-Ciastko, A. (2020). *Tutoring drogą do doskonałości akademickiej. Percepcja i implementacja personalizacji kształcenia w polskim szkolnictwie wyższym w latach 2014–2019* [Tutoring as a path to academic excellence: Perception and implementation of education personalization in the Polish Higher Education in the years 2014–2019]. Oficyna Wydawnicza IMPULS.
- Hashmi, G. (2014). Developing faculty learning communities at two-year colleges: Collaborative models to improve teaching and learning. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 38(10), 951–954. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2014.901814>
- International Finance Corporation. (2024). *Investing in inclusion. A guide to disability-inclusive education for higher education institutions. Report*. <https://www.ifc.org/content/dam/ifc/doc/2024/disability-inclusive-education-guide-for-higher-education-institutions.pdf>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- Lejzerowicz, M., & Podstawka, K. (2021). Developing authorship of own's life of a student with disability in social relationships. *Disability – Discourses of Special Education*, 41, 148–166.
- Senge, P. M. (1991). The fifth discipline, the art and practice of the learning organization. *Nonprofit Management Leadership*, 30(5), 37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pfi.4170300510>
- Solis-Grant, M. J., Bretti-López, M. J., Espinoza-Parçet, C., Pérez-Villalobos, C., Rodríguez-Núñez, I., Pincheira-Martínez, C., & Sepúlveda-Carrasco, C. (2023). Inclusion in the university: Who assumes responsibility? A qualitative study. *PloS ONE*, 18(1), e0280161. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280161>

Monika Czyżewska is an assistant professor at the Institute of Pedagogy at the Maria Grzegorzewska University and a co-initiator of the MGU Learning and Development Centre. Her research focuses on school culture, formative assessment, tutoring, the prevention of child maltreatment, children's well-being and museotherapy.

Magda Lejzerowicz is a researcher in disability studies, a philosopher and an assistant professor in the Institute of Interdisciplinary Disability Studies at The Maria Grzegorzewska University in Warsaw. Her scientific interests are the person with a disability as the subject of activities, identity and disability, stigma and social exclusion, communication with people with disabilities, and preparation of academic staff to work with people with disabilities. Dr Lejzerowicz collaborates with the Department for the Sociology and Anthropology of Culture at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences.

WE RECOMMEND

CIAE



Czech Institute of Academic Education z.s.

International Academic Conference on Teaching, Learning and E-learning and on Management, Economics, and Marketing, Oct 23, 2026, online

International Academic Conferences are an important international gathering of

scholars, educators and PhD students. Conference organized by the Czech Institute of Academic Education, z.s. in cooperation with the Czech Technical University in Prague.

Conference topics include: education, teaching, learning and e-learning education, teaching and learning, distance education, higher education, pedagogy, Erasmus and exchange experiences in universities, e-learning educational technology, educational games and software, as well as management consulting, management education, training and development, organizational behavior, technology and innovation management, and many others.

More information at: www.conferences-scientific.cz

'E-mentor' is one of the International Academic Conferences supporting journals.
Our readers will receive a 15% discount when they use the code **EMENTOR2026**.