https://doi.org/10.29197/cpu.v22i44.680

El profesorado universitario ante la innovación educativa para el desarrollo sostenible: el caso del proyecto Campus Ocean i³

University teaching staff and educational innovation for sustainable development: the case of the Campus Ocean project i³

Itziar Rekalde-Rodríguez[a]

[a] Doctora en Pedagogía y Profesora Plena en el Departamento de Didáctica y Organización escolar en la Universidad del País Vasco/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU) y miembro del grupo de investigación consolidado IkasGaraia (IT1637-22) financiado por el Gobierno Vasco.

Para contactar a la autora: itziar.rekalde@ehu.eus

Abstract

El profesorado universitario está inmerso en un contexto académico en el que las adaptaciones y los cambios son necesarios para poder dar respuesta a una sociedad en continua transformación. La innovación educativa es una respuesta a esta emergencia que precisa de planteamientos acordes a la Educación para el Desarrollo Sostenible. El objetivo de este estudio es comprender las razones por las que el profesorado interviene en innovaciones educativas para el desarrollo sostenible y la satisfacción que les reporta. Se adoptó una metodología cualitativa basada en el estudio de caso del proyecto transfronterizo Campus Ocean i3 desarrollado entre la Universidad del País Vasco (España) y la Universidad de Burdeos (Francia), con el soporte de 14 entrevistas en profundidad a docentes. Los resultados señalan que la implicación del profesorado se debe a motivos de carácter institucionales y estratégicos, y esta participación les satisface en tanto que les permite experimentar y probar, aprender de un entorno complejo e inestable, aprender de lo que se vive y se percibe, y participar sin presión. Se concluye que intervenir en un proyecto de innovación para el desarrollo sostenible pone en tela de juicio certezas que inducen al profesorado a aprender a reinventarse, para responder a la sociedad universitaria del siglo XXI.

Palabras clave: innovación educativa, educación para el desarrollo sostenible, universidad, profesorado, motivación.

ISSN (en línea): 1814-4152 / Sitio web: **http://cuaderno.pucmm.edu.do**

CÓMO CITAR: Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2025). El profesorado universitario ante la innovación educativa para el desarrollo sostenible: el caso del proyecto Campus Ocean i3. Cuaderno de Pedagogía Universitaria, 22(44). https://doi.org/10.29197/cpu.v22i44.680

Esta obra está bajo la licencia de Creative Commons Atribución 4.0 Internacional

Abstract

University teaching staff are immersed in an academic context in which adaptations and changes are necessary in order to be able to respond to a society in continuous transformation. Educational innovation is a response to this emergency that requires approaches in line with Education for Sustainable Development. The aim of this study is to understand the reasons why teachers are involved in educational innovation for sustainable development and the satisfaction they get from it. A qualitative methodology was adopted, based on a case study of the cross-border Campus Ocean i3 project, developed jointly by the University of the Basque Country (Spain) and the University of Bordeaux (France), backed by fourteen in-depth interviews that were conducted with participating faculty members. The results indicate that the teachers' involvement is due to personal, institutional and strategic reasons, and this participation satisfies because it allows them to experiment and test, to learn from a complex and unstable environment, to learn from what is experienced and perceived, and to participate without pressure. It is concluded that intervening in an innovation project for sustainable development challenges certainties that induce the teaching staff to learn to reinvent themselves in order to respond to the university society of the 21st century.

Keywords: *educational innovation, education for sustainable development, university, teaching* staff, motivation

Introduction

Andy Hargreaves et al. (2001) proclaimed, more than 20 years ago, that these were times of renewal because change was permeating life in the postmodern world; the acceleration of transformations, the deep understanding of time and space, cultural diversity, technological complexity, scientific uncertainty… all of this was, and continues to be, a reflection of the liquid modernity referred to by Zygmunt Bauman (2003), who characterized society by the fluidity and mobility of its relationships and bonds. This trend has not taken long to reach the university (Chaudhury and Jenkins, 2024).

In fact, the changes experienced by the university in recent years have been numerous, and the demands and responsibilities for those who make the university a space for knowledge generation and a driver of social change are multiple and varied (Lema et al., 2022). In tune with these transformations, those responsible for change within the university have had to reshape the teaching profession by modifying the approach to the teaching–learning process, moving from a teaching-based practice to one centered on learning (Águila and Sánchez-Sanz, 2024). This has implied a shift in the roles, functions, and responsibilities of the teacher, which in turn promotes, at least in part, greater student autonomy (Froment et al., 2023; Tomàs et al., 2010a). In just a few years, teaching staff have moved from delivering lecture-based classes guided by objectives that defined their practice, to a model focused on the development of student competencies, which requires combining theory and practice both in the classroom and in open spaces, as an inseparable binomial (Parejo and Cortón-Heras,

2025). Nevertheless, today's teaching staff remain flexible learners who must constantly adapt to the demands of a society in continuous transformation (Fernández and Rekalde, 2011; Rekalde and Mendia, 2020); individuals who must face the challenges of sustainable development through commitment to training and participation in processes of educational innovation (Rekalde-Rodríguez et al., 2021b). Therefore, the present research aims to reveal the reasons why teaching staff become involved in educational innovation projects for sustainable development, as well as the satisfaction they derive from such involvement, in order to propose recommendations that may guide teaching staff in their decision-making.

Education for Sustainable Development in the University

Universities play an important role in shaping the future of global society in terms of sustainable development, as they generate new knowledge and contribute to the development of appropriate competencies, as well as to sustainability awareness (Rieckmann and Bormann, 2020). This aligns with university policies that support this purpose (Filho et al., 2021). In this sense, the university is understood as a potential driving agent of change in addressing sustainability, given that its work focuses on training future professionals whose decisions will directly or indirectly influence their environment (Filho et al., 2024). In fact, working on and reflecting upon sustainability during university education leads to the adoption of ethical criteria related to sustainable development and to the inclusion of sustainability as part of professional competencies (Zinkunegi-Goitia and Rekalde-Rodríguez, 2022).

Overall, the incorporation of Education for Sustainable Development (ESD) (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], 2014) into the university is necessary to improve individual capacity and commitment in building sustainable societies (Prabawani et al., 2020). This requires a curriculum that is transversally infused with the principles of ESD (Cruz-Iglesias et al., 2022), which highlight the training of teaching staff in essential competencies to face the challenges of sustainable development in today's world and to prepare for those of the future (UNESCO, 2017). Among other aspects, it becomes relevant to adopt inter- and transdisciplinary perspectives when addressing global changes and their impacts at the local level. Likewise, a transformative pedagogy with a practical orientation is proposed, one that motivates students to actively participate in processes of reflection and action, with a systemic, creative, and innovative approach within the community environment.

To this end, current literature emphasizes strategies such as active methodologies, which focus on student learning (Evans, 2019). These are strategies that align with ESD and make transformative pedagogy possible, involving a student-centered, action-oriented approach, based on active modes of practice, in alternative spaces (Rekalde-Rodríguez et al., 2024), with inter/transdisciplinary approaches (Barth et al., 2023; Pérez and Rodríguez, 2017), and with evaluation methods consistent with these principles (Redman et al., 2021). The future lies, as Garcia-Alvarez et al. (2023) remind us, in moving toward deeper levels of learning, transitioning from education about sustainability to education for sustainability, with the ultimate goal of education as sustainability.

Educational Innovation in the 21st-Century University

The concept of innovation is closely linked to the social, political, cultural, economic, and other dimensions of our lives; hence, it is a term in constant development and revision (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2020). In fact, it is complex and profound (Pizzolitto and Macchiarola, 2015), with a meaning that is tied to the context and to the institutions, organizations, and systems that put it into practice (Hannan and Silver, 2005). As for the concept of educational innovation, it emerged in pedagogical discourse in the 1970s as a response to a process of inquiry into new ideas, proposals, and collective contributions, with the aim of finding solutions to problematic situations in educational practice. Today, however, it goes beyond providing solutions, as it seeks to transform the reality of education and impact society (Marín and Pino-Juste, 2022). In this sense, the university must respond with innovative approaches to the challenges it faces: a greater number and diversity of students, the promotion of lifelong learning, meeting the demands of the labor market, and fostering a new citizenship for the learning society (Hannan et al., 2000; Rodríguez-Rodríguez, 2024), always from a humanistic, critical, ethical, and equitable perspective (Vázquez et al., 2021).

The main reason for initiating change is that people do not feel comfortable and, consequently, want to change that situation (Tomàs et al., 2010b). But what need does innovation respond to? Where does the need for teachers to innovate come from? According to Etxague (2006), it is the social context that generates concerns, demands, and expectations directed at education and its teaching staff, requiring them to adapt and foster new ways of teaching and learning. The classic work of King and Anderson (1995) distinguishes three possible origins in the initiation of educational innovation: the stimulating origin (when the need for innovation arises from the agents involved); the imported origin (when innovation comes from outside and is adapted to a new context); and the established origin (when it is imposed). However, Imbernón (2024) emphasizes that innovation should be intrinsic to the educational and professionalization process, in which mechanisms must be established to facilitate it. Overall, processes of debate, dialogue, and consensus around innovation projects should be encouraged, while individualistic and isolated professional practices among teaching staff should be minimized.

Currently, innovation is being strengthened within the framework of higher education (Fernández-Martínez et al., 2020), understood as a genuine instrument for radically transforming university culture and, therefore, making teaching a more horizontal activity for those involved, more responsible toward the environment, and more ethical (Alkorta, 2011). As Feixas and Martínez-Usarralde (2022) acknowledge, this approach is characterized by fostering the creation of innovative proposals while transforming modes of teaching and learning, as well as the institutional culture of teaching teams and the university as a whole.

In this regard, educational innovation projects offer the university community the opportunity to support teaching staff seeking to implement transformative approaches, foster collaborative work within interdisciplinary teaching teams, promote an academic approach grounded in educational research, and influence institutional impact (Schophuizen and Kalz, 2020).

Thus, the study by Ereñaga and Rekalde-Rodríguez (2021) showed that innovation projects developed over 15 years at the University of the Basque Country/Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU) led to the formation, development, and consolidation of innovation teaching teams—teams concerned with improving student learning processes. These evolved from research objectives focused on the classroom to objectives linked to the curricular development of degree programs, eventually reaching projects whose goals extended beyond the academic sphere into the social domain.

This process has occurred mainly thanks to the work of teaching teams in which collaboration, dialogue, and commitment are key to situated learning (Arandia and Rekalde-Rodríguez, 2014; Paricio et al., 2019). In other words, a horizontal form of training, understood as a continuous process that promotes interaction and peer learning, as well as dialogue with external agents and the community (Tierney and Lanford, 2018), where collaboration among colleagues is seen as fundamental to their professional development (Imbernón, 2024).

Furthermore, the scientific literature highlights the need to conduct research on educational innovation in higher education—research from a scientific perspective on innovation experiences, the curricular aspects that influence them (Roig-Vila, 2020), and the professional development they generate (Porto et al., 2024). However, inquiry into the reasons why teaching staff engage in educational innovation processes for sustainable development is still underdeveloped.

Research Questions and Objectives

The research questions that have guided this study are framed within the Ocean i^3 educational innovation project, which is characterized by its development in a cross-border environment between the Basque Country and New Aquitaine, as well as its interdisciplinary and intercultural nature involving two universities: the University of the Basque Country/ Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea (UPV/EHU, Spain) and the University of Bordeaux (UB, France). The project involves both students and teaching staff from different undergraduate and postgraduate programs, as well as social agents located on both sides of the border.

The research questions are formulated with the aim of guiding the inquiry toward understanding the reasons why teaching staff engage in innovation projects linked to sustainable development and what they ultimately gain from this participation. Some of these questions include: Why do university teachers engage in educational innovation projects? Why do they engage specifically in projects grounded in Education for Sustainable Development (ESD), such as Campus Ocean i3? What do teachers gain from this participation? Does the final level of satisfaction correspond to their initial expectations?

1. To examine the motivations that lead teaching staff to participate in innovation projects for sustainable development.

2. To analyze the satisfaction that participation in educational innovation projects for sustainable development generates among teaching staff.

After contextualizing the project in relation to the Sustainable Development Goals and its challenge-based pedagogical approach, the following section presents the qualitative methodology adopted, based on a case study. Likewise, the characteristics of the participating teaching staff are described, along with the data collection techniques (in-depth interviews and expert consultation) and the data analysis process through emerging categories.

The results are organized around the motivations that justify the participation of teaching staff—personal, institutional, and strategic—as well as the satisfaction derived from this experience. Finally, the findings are discussed in light of the literature, conclusions are presented, and recommendations are proposed to promote teaching staff participation in innovation projects grounded in Education for Sustainable Development.

Methodology

In accordance with the framework provided by the literature and the research objectives, an interpretative approach has been adopted, aiming to understand the reasons why teaching staff participate in an educational innovation project for sustainable development (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). In this case, the qualitative approach has guided us to understand unique and particular situations, such as Campus Ocean i^3, to seek the meaning and sense that participants assign to their actions, and how they live, perceive, and experience that participation (Cotán, 2016).

The case study is one of the most characteristic strategies of the qualitative approach (Angulo and Vázquez, 2003). This method has been chosen because it is considered appropriate for analyzing a situation in depth (Stake, 1998) and for studying the context thoroughly (Fiss, 2009). The case study allows for obtaining meaningful information closely connected to the context, offering both an overall view of the case and different perspectives on that reality (Thomas, 2011).

Context

Ocean i^3 is a collaborative project between UPV/EHU and UB, which responds to the positioning of both universities regarding sustainability and the valorization of the oceans, directly addressing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of Life Below Water (14), Clean Water and Sanitation (6), and Quality Education (4), from the 2030 Agenda adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 2015 (United Nations, 2015).

Ocean i^3 has been funded by the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), through the third call of the Interreg V-A Spain, France, Andorra program (POCTEFA 2014–2020). It is a key project that promotes the development of student competencies related to sustainability and employability, in this case linked to the blue economy of the cross-border coastal area. Within this project, students develop their academic work (mainly Final Degree Projects—TFG—, Master's Theses—TFM—, Practicum, and course-based projects) within an interdisciplinary and multi-agent team (students, teaching staff, social agents, collaborators), which brings them together to respond to a challenge rooted in the need to address environmental and social issues, specifically the reduction of plastic pollution along the Basque–New Aquitaine coastline (Cruz-Iglesias et al., 2022; Gil-Molina et al., 2024; Rekalde-Rodríguez et al., 2021a, 2021b, 2023). The methodological-didactic approach

is based on the principles of active learning and on the frameworks of Challenge-Based Learning (López-Fraile et al., 2021; Nichols et al., 2016; Pinto and Soto, 2021; Portuguez and Gómez, 2020). From the technical team of Ocean i³, the need was identified to strengthen a key aspect within this learning ecosystem: the participation, involvement, and action of teaching staff within this complex structure. For this reason, a request was made to the Educational Advisory Service (SAE-HELAZ) of UPV/EHU for an Educational Innovation Project (EIP). From this service, a range of EIP types is deployed, from more initial classroom-based projects (prototype 1) to inter- or transdisciplinary projects aimed at institutionalization after a consolidated trajectory (prototype 5). The requested EIP was named Campus Ocean i³ and was recognized as the first prototype 5 in 2022–2023.

The aim of this project was not only for teaching staff to lead, advise, and support the activities through which students engage in Ocean i³, but also to foster their commitment to action within this learning ecosystem. The method of intervention and inquiry in this EIP was action research, which combines different strategies that enable teacher training through issues of concern identified as relevant to be addressed (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). Due to the nature of this approach, its collaborative positioning is emphasized, oriented toward the creation of reflection groups grounded in practice, with the aim of improving educational action within Ocean i³ (Sandín, 2003).

Participants

Fourteen teaching staff members participated in this study, all of whom were continuously involved in the development of Campus Ocean i³. They represent diverse profiles, as shown in Table 1.

Tabla 1

Perfil del profesorado participante

Categoría	Subcategoría	Cantidad de docentes
Género	Femenino	10
	Masculino	4
Edad	30-39	2
	40-49	4
	50-59	5
	60-69	3
Facultad	Facultad de Letras	1
	Facultad de Ciencias Sociales y de la Comunicación	2
	Facultad de Derecho	1
	Facultad de Educación	4
	Facultad de Bellas Artes	2
	Facultad de Medicina y Enfermería	2
	Facultad de Economía y Empresa	2

Todas las voces han sido codificadas para preservar el anonimato. La codificación ha sido la siguiente: Entrevista + nº de la persona entrevistada= E3, por ejemplo.

Techniques

In-depth interviews were used, as this is a widely employed technique in cases where the sample is small, with the aim of maximizing the use of information (Flyvbjerg, 2011). In these interviews, participants were asked to observe, examine, and reflect on Campus Ocean i³ in order to understand what and how they interpret the motivations and satisfaction derived from their participation (Flick, 2012).

To this end, an interview guide was developed based on the work of Feixas and Martínez-Usarralde (2022), who explored the impact of teaching innovation projects at the University of Valencia, emphasizing aspects such as the impact on student learning; the teaching and learning culture, as well as the role of professors within the innovation group, among others.

Additionally, an advisory group was created to discuss the research design, the instruments to be used, and the results obtained. This group is inspired by the advisory board characteristic of the communicative methodology, functioning as a structure that ensures dialogue with experts throughout the research process (Alonso, 2015).

Analysis

A content analysis was carried out, as it provides a systematic approach to uncover meaning in textual data, both at the surface level and implicitly (Kleinheksel et al., 2020). This system was progressively adapted, reshaped, and tested as the analysis advanced (McMillan and Schumacher, 2005). The categorical system was emergent, and the result is presented in Table 2.

Tabla 2

Sistema categorial

Dimensión	Metacategoría	Categoría	Subcategoría
Implicación del profesorado en innovación	Carácter personal		
	Institucional	Asignada	
		Derivada	
	Estratégica	Motivos internos	Temática
			Complejidad
			Autoaprendizaje
		Motivos externos	Autoaprendizaje
Satisfacción del profesorado con la innovación	Experimentar y probar		
	Aprender en la complejidad e inestabilidad		
	Proyecto referente de la universidad		
	Participar sin presión		
	Aprender de lo vivido		

To process all the information and manage the data, the qualitative analysis software NVivo 14 was used, and the steps outlined by Sabariego (2024) were followed.

Quality and Ethics in Educational Research

Regarding scientific rigor, the criteria of credibility, confirmability, and transferability were taken into account (Gurdián-Fernández, 2007), and ethical considerations were strictly observed. In fact, the research is registered in the data processing registry under code TI0625 and has been favorably evaluated by the Ethics Committee for Research Involving Human Beings (CEISH) of UPV/EHU, reference M10_2023_377.

Results

To begin with, we will start by making sense of the framework provided by the testimonies of the participants in this research.

The reasons that teaching staff put forward for becoming involved in an Educational Innovation Project (EIP) related to sustainable development may be multiple, but the contributions that are repeatedly collected from participants in Campus Ocean i³ refer to those linked to a personal inclination toward innovation; those linked to institutional duties, that is, a connection driven by the positions and roles they hold; and, finally, those whose involvement is motivated by strategic variables inherent to the project, which encourage them to participate in Ocean i³.

Regarding personal involvement, the voices collected refer to situations, circumstances, and/or the reasons why participants engage in innovation due to their personal characteristics, which relate to their spontaneous way of being, to feeling free, to perceiving themselves as self-taught, and to identifying as freelance, as mentioned by one of the participants. In other words, the justification for their involvement stems from each teacher's way of being, from being curious, nonconformist individuals who constantly seek improvement: "Innovation has always been part of my life; I have never left a subject the way I found it, I have always tried to improve it and implement those innovations that I considered appropriate" (E5). In this same sense, there are those who understand the classroom as a space for lived experience and experimentation, linked to their concern about not repeating themselves and avoiding the monotony that teaching can sometimes entail:

> "I have always been very self-taught; I have always liked experimenting with students, and in fact I still do. I always do new things; I invent games, activities; yes, yes, I like experimenting with them. I think I am very creative, I do very different things, I like taking them out of their comfort zone, taking them to a place where they are brave, confronting them with another way of thinking, another way of seeing the world around us." (E11)

Innovation aligns with their way of being and helps them to be creative in the classroom, with the aim of cognitively activating students.

Regarding **institutional involvement,** the voices collected refer to situations, circumstances, and/or the reasons why participants engage in innovation based on the recognized support offered by the university itself through EIPs. Here, it is important to differentiate between institutional involvement assigned by the position

held within the organization and that derived from motivations related to improving student performance and the overall quality of teaching.

With regard to **involvement assigned** by the position held, participation in innovation is described as something inherited, linked to assuming the responsibilities of the role occupied, for example, within a faculty management team or as a member of different degree committees. Thus, the following is highlighted:

> "My participation in EIPs began shortly after joining the university; I became part of the management team of the former university school of Nursing, where there was already a long-standing trajectory in both management and, above all, teaching innovation. It is clear that my incorporation into the university has been linked to educational innovation from the very beginning." (E6)

> "Well, the first time it was circumstantial because I was the coordinator of the Practicum in Pedagogy. In that EIP, all the degree coordinators became involved, so it was circumstantial; I wasn't very sure at first, but the truth is that it was a very satisfying experience." (E8)

In both cases, as can be seen, the motivation toward the project arises after their initial involvement; it is the role they hold that leads them to take on innovation tasks.

Regarding **involvement derived** from a deliberate decision to design and implement innovation in order to give new meaning to teaching and to how it is constructed, the comments indicate that:

> "My first innovation project was when I started in the Department of Cell Biology and Histology in the Faculty of Medicine. There was a desire to modify the way classes were taught, so that teaching in those seminar groups would be carried out in a different way." (E13)

> "A group of professors from different departments reflected on how we worked in small groups in class, whether we used journals, records, what meetings were like… we met regularly to share these experiences… we reached conclusions on how to work in small groups and so on." (E10)

In these cases, motivation derives from previous experiences related to rethinking teaching.

Regarding **strategic involvement**, the voices collected refer to situations, circumstances, and/or the reasons why participants engage in an EIP for sustainability such as Ocean i³. Here, participants differentiate between internal and external motivations.

With respect to internal motivations, these refer to personal, internal, and more intimate reasons why participants emphasize their involvement. Among these, it is possible to distinguish motivations linked to the theme of the innovation, the complexity of the project, and others related to self-learning. Internal motivations linked to the theme refer to those derived from the topic of the ocean, its care, and its protection. In this regard, it is stated: "My experience in the field of journalism has shaped my work in Ocean i³; the connection that the project has with the real world and its problems has been key for me." (E1) Likewise, it is noted:

> "Fundamentally, it was the theme; I am very interested in the environment, specifically sustainability and the environment, which is what I now want to focus my research on, and that was really what motivated me. I didn't know what I was getting into, I didn't know it would have institutional recognition, I didn't know anything; what I saw was an opportunity to connect teaching with a topic that personally interests me." (E2)

In this sense, some participants also highlight the dual perspective offered by the context of Ocean i³, bringing together a topic closely linked to sustainability, such as ocean plastic pollution, with a new way of approaching teaching. For some teachers, the topic of the ocean and plastics is closely related to their scientific training and therefore of interest. Additionally, the methodological aspects of how to approach teaching around this topic, through real challenges with the possibility of going beyond the exercises typically carried out in class, represent another dimension of interest for teaching staff. Ultimately, this fusion becomes a reason to reinforce their involvement. As participants state:"What caught my attention was that there was a reasonable mix of those two elements that I found interesting: rethinking or transforming the way we teach and, on the other hand, incorporating aspects of sustainability." (E7)

It is interesting to highlight how the topic of the ocean and its sustainability becomes a key motivating factor, but equally significant is the motivation generated by the transformation of teaching itself.

Internal motivations linked to the complexity of the project refer to those derived from all the variables inherent in Ocean i³. Participants broadly agree in highlighting three main characteristics of the project: its cross-border, interdisciplinary, and multilingual nature. This is illustrated by the following statements:

- "I was attracted by the fact that it was an inter-university, cross-border, and multilingual project." (E3)
- "That is where my interest in the cross-border aspect, French philology, the Basque-French region… and multilingualism emerged." (E1)

- “We saw that it was an opportunity to participate in interdisciplinary teams.” (E6)
- “I was attracted by its inter-university, multilingual, and cross-border nature. When I saw that other disciplines converged, that made me even more interested. In addition, the involvement of social agents seemed extremely interesting to me.” (E3)

These are the characteristics of the project itself—its multilingual, cross-border, and inter-university nature—that are highlighted as reasons for participation, along with transdisciplinary and the connection to territory through social agents and the challenges posed. In general terms, these are perceived as distinctive elements that generate interest and commitment, as reflected in various accounts emphasizing the value of working between universities from different countries, collaborating across disciplines, and doing so in diverse linguistic contexts.

Internal motivations linked to self-learning refer to those reasons derived from one’s own learning and improvement, understood as a driving force that leads teaching staff to engage in self-directed learning based on the environment and the opportunities it offers. Participants express this as follows:

> “It seemed like a good opportunity to learn and improve as a teacher. (…) I did see in Ocean i³ and in Campus Ocean i³ that there was an opportunity, a challenge to enter a territory that was unknown to me, such as sustainability, and to participate in something I was not familiar with. I think I do have that disposition to say, well, I don’t know anything about this, so let’s see what it’s about.” (E10)

Regarding external motivations, these include voices that refer to reasons linked to approaching the UPV/EHU educational model and to improving student training, which teaching staff mention as motivations for participating in this project:

> “The opportunity came through the head of the department. I said, this is my chance—it’s an innovation project; I knew the ikd educational model in theory, but I hadn’t done anything in innovation, and it seemed like a good opportunity.” (E9)

> “My dilemma was how I could bring accounting into the realm of the sustainable development paradigm, and that is my motivation for participating in Ocean i³, because I see it as a learning opportunity, a way to bring that idea, that new paradigm, into education.” (E11)

These are motivations that relate to the strategic lines of the university, but combined with the need to simultaneously respond to improving student training:“My motivation was to offer something different to the students. I got involved more for them than for myself, thinking about the students, to offer them something different.” (E13) In addition, they add the following:

> "It all started with a presentation on the results of the first edition of Ocean i³, where they were important for health. And I thought, well, why wouldn't what Law students have done also be done by Nursing students, when the topic of health is so present in all areas of reality and society." (E6)

> "The topic of the oceans seemed to us an interesting platform for students to address a subject through challenges and generate concrete materials. A student, in order to create a graphic design, needs content, and Ocean i³ was an opportunity for students to have that content, which is what they usually lack." (E14)

According to the teaching staff, Ocean i³ appears to be an ESD environment for offering new learning experiences to students.

> "It all started with a presentation on the results of the first edition of Ocean i³, where they were important for health. And I thought, well, why wouldn't what Law students have done also be done by Nursing students, when the topic of health is so present in all areas of reality and society." (E6)

> "The topic of the oceans seemed to us an interesting platform for students to address a subject through challenges and generate concrete materials. A student, in order to create a graphic design, needs content, and Ocean i³ was an opportunity for students to have that content, which is what they usually lack." (E14)

According to the teaching staff, Ocean i³ appears to be an ESD environment for offering new learning experiences to students.

Regarding the satisfaction derived from participating in an innovation project for sustainability, voices emerge that highlight the possibility of experimenting and testing within a safe and protected environment supported by the community; learning within the complexity and instability that comes from direct contact with reality; and learning from lived and experienced situations. The fact that the project is considered a benchmark within the university is also a source of satisfaction, as is the possibility of participating without the pressure often felt in other academic spaces. Let us examine each of these aspects in more detail.

A positive evaluation is made in that teaching staff have been able to **experiment and test**, in a safe way, active methodologies, dynamic approaches, and creative activities, as well as other forms of teaching that combine face-to-face and virtual modes… supported by a network of shared engagement that the Campus Ocean i³ community represents: "It has given me a different perspective on teaching that I hope will help me in the future." (E3); "I have had the opportunity to learn a lot, to

try things out, to roll up my sleeves and experiment. I have met people who have been very valuable over these years and with whom I have continued to collaborate afterward." (E7). Similarly, they comment:

> "For me, I have learned a great deal. Working on this project has been a privilege, experimenting on a large scale; perhaps in a course I could have done it on a very small scale, but Ocean i³ has meant large-scale experimentation. Above all, being able to continue experimenting in other contexts and to pass this on to others. It has been a fantastic experience, without a doubt." (E1)

The **complexity of the project** and the instability of certainties are also valued, both of which are associated with the complexity of the environment that leads them to learn how to reinvent themselves as teachers:

> "For me, instability is a stimulus that generates dissatisfaction. It is that instability that helps me step out of my comfort zone, it is what allows me to move forward and question myself. You suffer a bit, but it is what allows me to grow." (E10)

There are also those who feel a sense of pride and satisfaction in the fact that the project has become a reference within the university, as they recognize that this gives meaning to what they are doing: "What I like is the systematic way in which the project has been carried out and, above all, I have felt involvement from the teaching staff who have participated, and that is not usually common." (E14) Another participant adds:

> "In fact, from Campus Ocean i³ we were very aligned with what the university was asking of us, and we have been able to move in that direction and become a reference within the university itself. And I am very satisfied because we are a reference; when they talk about EIPs, about innovation, they take us as an example, and that is a source of pride and a great satisfaction. Because it means doing things with purpose and rigor, in addition to being aligned with the content coming from Europe and from the university itself." (E8)

There are those who emphasize that, for them, this project has been like an oasis in the desert; it has offered them the opportunity to dedicate themselves to what they truly enjoy. That is, to work on what academia represents for them, and, moreover, **without pressure:**

> "With all the pressure we have around us—publishing, projects, student satisfaction surveys… that pressure in every area… well, I am going to dedicate myself to this, which at first does not bring me any merit; it does not give me research recognition or anything that frees me from work… but even so, I do it and I get hooked because I like it and it satisfies me, and it makes me feel good. Because you reach a stage in your life where you say, I am going to do what I want and what I enjoy, enough with the pressure." (E9)

Finally, among the teaching staff, there are those who emphasize that, considering all the elements involved in their participation, they value most what has been lived and learned; **living to learn, learning to live:** "My expectation was to learn, I had no greater expectation, and of course it has been fulfilled." (E12) Along the same lines, they expressed the following:

> "If I take stock, if I think about the time invested considering the hours with students, workshops, and so on, I have come out losing. Because it has been a lot of work, but personally, if I put it on the scale of what I have learned, then I have come out winning. At the Nursing faculty conference we held in Cádiz, I shared the Ocean i³ experience and they were amazed. They were amazed by this project. And they asked me, but what are you in Nursing doing with ocean-related topics? Tell us, tell us. They saw it as very positive and very unusual. In our field of knowledge, we are very focused on health, but linked not only to the healthcare field, but specifically to the healthcare system, and presenting this type of project also opened the eyes of colleagues in the field." (E6)

Discussion and Conclusions

The reasons why university teaching staff have engaged in Campus Ocean i³ are diverse. What stands out most is their involvement in innovation for sustainability driven by their character and way of being; by being curious and nonconformist individuals who do not feel comfortable with repetitive teaching practices and seek to transform their teaching in order to improve it, as well as to feel better about themselves.

In this regard, King and Anderson (1995) point out how stimulating it can be for teaching staff to engage in innovation activities. However, there are also those who refer to motivations linked to the theme of sustainability around which the project is structured: the ocean, its protection, and its complexity. This aligns with what Filho et al. (2024) and Prabawani et al. (2020) highlight regarding the important role of the university and its teaching staff in addressing sustainability-related content.

There are also those who are more motivated by the self-learning opportunities that the project environment itself facilitates and supports, which is consistent with what Imbernón (2024) describes as the intrinsic motivation of teaching staff to engage in innovation within the university.

Those who become involved for external reasons are those who feel the need to participate, as it is a program supported by the institution, and thus allows them to approach the educational model promoted by the university, known as ikd i³. This motivation is consistent with what Filho et al. (2021) point out, emphasizing the

importance of alignment between university policies and the support they provide to teaching staff. There are also those whose participation stems from the institutional role they hold. In this case, rather than motivation toward innovation, we are referring to involvement driven by the tasks and functions associated with the position they occupy. This aligns with King and Anderson (1995), who note that teaching staff involvement in innovation may originate from complying with and following institutional norms.

Tomàs et al. (2010b) emphasize that the reasons for teaching staff to engage in innovation actions arise from not feeling comfortable with their situation and, consequently, wanting change. Furthermore, research highlights the importance of considering motivation as a key factor of analysis in innovation projects (Feixas and Martínez-Usarralde, 2022). Therefore, the reasons behind participation are not trivial. Personal, institutional, and strategic motivations together form a process of adaptation to which teaching staff are subject. Indeed, societal demands influence the tasks they must undertake, encouraging adaptation and shaping particularities according to the university context (Tierney and Lanford, 2018).

In any case, university teaching staff are motivated by diverse reasons to engage in innovation, following the principles of ESD (UNESCO, 2014) in initiatives grounded in sustainability, seeking both to enrich themselves through the educational experience and to contribute to quality education, as also highlighted by Paricio et al. (2019).

Regarding the satisfaction derived from their participation in the project, participants' perceptions are highly positive, as Campus Ocean i³ provides them with the opportunity to experiment and test, within a safe and protected environment, active methodologies, dynamic approaches, and creative activities, along with other teaching modalities that combine face-to-face and virtual formats. In short, these are methodologies that promote an inter/transdisciplinary approach aligned with ESD, as emphasized in the literature (Barth et al., 2023; Evans, 2019).

Learning within the complexity and instability promoted by the project challenges established certainties, as this complexity requires teaching staff to learn how to reinvent themselves as educators. Teaching staff emphasize that the project is like an oasis in the desert, as it offers them the opportunity to dedicate themselves to what they truly enjoy: teaching as a fundamental and socially visible part of academic work.

The study shows that Campus Ocean i³ has required a curious attitude from teaching staff in order to respond to the internal demand of being in constant dialogue with the context, enabling them to interpret what emerges while responding to it—ideas that are reflected in the work of Feixas and Martínez-Usarralde (2022) and Schophuizen and Kalz (2020).

The **conclusions** drawn from this study, presented in a synthesized manner, reveal that:

- The reasons why university teaching staff engage in innovation projects for sustainability such as Campus Ocean i³ have been mainly internal, related to their personal characteristics (nonconformity, challenges, and personal satisfaction, self-learning…) and, to a lesser extent, external, related to institutional and strategic factors (institutional support, university recognition, prestige...).

- The satisfaction derived from their involvement stems from the complexity of the innovation project for sustainability, as it leads them to adopt an attitude of continuous learning through experimentation and reflection, supported and protected by a network of shared engagement generated within the environment itself.

In short, an innovation environment grounded in ESD, such as Ocean i³, allows teaching staff to work on and for the improvement of teaching through inquiry and reflection. This requires a constant curiosity to remain in continuous dialogue with those who participate in the environment, in order to question and interpret the ongoing changes that occur.

One point to note is that, despite these encouraging findings, future research could benefit from data triangulation using other methods that provide nuance to the testimonies, as well as new perspectives on the object of study. Nevertheless, in this research it should also be highlighted that the advisory group played an important role as an expert reference point.

We conclude this work by offering some recommendations, with the aim of promoting the involvement of university teaching staff in innovation projects for sustainable development:

- Be receptive to the changes and variations that are constantly generated in an unstable environment related to sustainable development.

- Demonstrate strong internal motivation, driven by the continuous need to learn in order to respond to and improve educational practice.

- Be supported by a teaching team that enables the exchange of new ideas, the discussion of perspectives, and the creation of original teaching strategies.

- Create an environment of freedom when engaging in innovation, where

curiosity, meaningful and rigorous experimentation, and enjoyment of the teaching activity are essential.

Received: 3/6/2025 / **Revised:** 18/3/2025 / **Approved:** 25/5/2025 / **Published:** 9/7/2025

Bibliographical References

Águila, C. y Sánchez-Sanz, A. (2024). Experiencias pedagógicas conscientes en educación superior. Un estudio cualitativo. *Educar, 60*(1), 19–32. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/educar.1716

Alkorta, I. (2011). Introducción. En I. Fernández e I. Rekalde. (Eds.), *Una universidad que aprende: innovación y cambio educativo en la UPV/EHU.* Servicio editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU).

Alonso, I. (2015). *Cambios en la identidad y cultura docente en procesos de innovación educativa en la Educación Superior. Estudio de un caso* [Tesis doctoral, Universidad del País Vasco]. Archivo digital. http://hdl.handle.net/10810/21694

Angulo, F. y Vázquez, R. (2003). Los estudios de caso. Una aproximación teórica. En *Introducción a los estudios de casos. Los primeros contactos con la investigación etnográfica* (pp. 15–51). Algibe.

Arandia, M. y Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2014). La formación de equipos de coordinación para el desarrollo curricular de los grados: el programa ehundu de la UPV/EHU. REDU. *Revista de Docencia Universitaria, 12*(4), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.4995/redu.2014.5616

Barth, M., Jiménez-Aceituno, A., Lam, D., Bürgener, L., & Lang, D. (2023). Transdisciplinary learning as a key leverage for sustainability transformations. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 64*, e101361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2023.101361

Bauman, Z. (2003). *La cultura en el mundo de la modernidad líquida.* Fondo de Cultura Económica.

Chaudhury, P. y Jenkins, C. (2024). Retos mundiales, soluciones locales: el papel de las universidades en la educación del futuro. *Papeles de economía española,* (180). https://www.funcas.es/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/PEE-180_Chaudhury_Jenkins1.pdf

Cotán, A. (2016). El sentido de la investigación cualitativa. *Escuela Libre, 19*, 33–48.

Cruz-Iglesias, E., Gil-Molina P., & Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2022). A navigation chart for sustainability for the Ocean i³ Educational project. *Sustainability, 14*(8), e4764. https://doi.org/10.3390/su14084764

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research.* Sage.

Ereñaga, A., & Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2021). Hezkuntza Berrikuntza Proiektuak Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatean. *El Guiniguada. Revista de investigaciones y experiencias en Ciencias de la Educación,* (30), 104–121. https://ojsspdc.ulpgc.es/ojs/index.php/ElGuiniguada/article/view/1323

Etxague, X. (2006). Introducción. En J. Guisasola y T. Nuño. (Eds.), *La educación universitaria en tiempos de cambio* (pp. 9–19). Servicio Editorial de la Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU).

Evans, T. (2019). Competencies and pedagogies for Sustainability Education: A roadmap for sustainability studies program development in colleges and universities. *Sustainability, 11*(19). https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195526

Feixas, M. y Martínez-Usarralde, M. (2022). La transferencia de los proyectos de innovación docente: un estudio sobre su capacidad de transformar la enseñanza y el aprendizaje. *Educar, 58*(1), 69–84.

Fernández, I. y Rekalde, I. (2011). Análisis del impacto de la formación continua del PDI en la UPV/EHU (2006–2011): retrospectiva y líneas de avance. En I. Fernández e I. Rekalde. (Coords.), *Una universidad que aprende: innovación y cambio educativo en la UPV/EHU* (pp. 19–44). Servicio editorial de la UPV/EHU.

Fernández-Martínez, M., Carrión, J., Luque, A. y Román, I. (Coords.). (2020). *Innovación docente en la universidad y realidades emergentes.* Octaedro.

Filho, W., Lange, A., Frankenberger, F., Mohammed, N., Sen, S., Silvpalan, S., Nono-Corti, I., Venkatesan, M., & Emblen-Perry, K. (2021). Governance and Sustainable Development at higher education institutions. *Environment, Development and Sustainability, 23*(5), 6002–6020. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00859-y

Filho, W., Trevisan, L., Dinis, M., Ulmer, N., Paço, A., Borsari, B., Sierra, J., & Salvia, A. (2024). Fostering students' participation in the implementation of the sustainable development goals at higher education institutions. *Discover Sustainability, 5*(22). https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-024-00204-7

Fiss, P. (2009). Case studies and the configurational analysis of organizational phenomena. In D. Byrne & C. Ragin (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of case-based methods* (pp. 424–440). SAGE Publications.

Flick, U. (2012). *Introducción a la investigación cualitativa.* Ediciones Morata.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2011). Case study. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 301–316). SAGE Publications.

Froment, F., De-Besa, M. y Gil, J. (2023). Efecto del apoyo a la autonomía sobre la satisfacción académica: la motivación y el compromiso académico como variables mediadoras. *Revista de Investigación Educativa, 41*(2), 479–499. https://doi.org/10.6018/rie.546251

Garcia-Alvarez, M., Rekalde-Rodríguez, I., & Gil-Molina, P. (2023). No transition without transformation: educating sustainability. In W. Leal et al. (Eds.), *SDGs in the European Region. Implementing the UN Sustainable Development Goals – Regional Perspectives.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-91261-1_98-1

Gil-Molina, P., Cruz-Iglesias, E., & Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2024). Developing competences in a cross-border interdisciplinary project: student and teacher perceptions of the Ocean i³ project. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 21*(1). https://doi.org/10.53761/677RFM42

Gurdián-Fernández, A. (2007). *El paradigma cualitativo en la investigación socioeducativa.* IDER.

Hannan, A. y Silver, H. (2005). *La innovación en la enseñanza superior. Enseñanza, aprendizaje y culturas institucionales.* Narcea.

Hannan, A., Silver, H., & English, S. (2000). Teaching and learning in higher education: issues of innovation. In *Differing visions of a Learning Society.* Policy Press.

Hargreaves, A., Earl, L., Moore, S. y Manning, S. (2001). *Aprender a cambiar. La enseñanza más allá de las materias y los niveles.* Octaedro.

Imbernón, F. (2024). Tendencias y retos internacionales en la formación permanente del profesorado para la innovación educativa. *RECIE. Revista Caribeña de Investigación Educativa, 8*(1), 215–229. https://doi.org/10.32541/recie.2024.v8i1

Kemmis, S. y Mc Taggart, R. (1988). *Cómo planificar la investigación-acción.* Laertes.

King, N., & Anderson, N. (1995). *Innovation and change in organizations.* Routledge.

Kleinheksel, A., Rockich-Winston, N., Tawfik, H., & Wyattasha, T. (2020). Demystifying content analysis. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 84*(1). https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7113

Lema, B., Lema, A. y Delgado, E. (2022). Premisas para la sostenibilidad de la universidad contemporánea. *Revista Universidad y Sociedad, 14*(1), 511–516.

López-Fraile, L., Agüero, M. y Jiménez-García, E. (2021). Efecto del aprendizaje basado en retos sobre las tasas académicas. *Formación Universitaria, 14*, 65–74.

Marín, J. y Pino-Juste, M. (Coords.). (2022). *Innovación educativa para una educación transformadora.* Dykinson.

McMillan, J. y Schumacher, S. (2005). *Investigación educativa. Una introducción conceptual.* Pearson.

Nichols, M., Cator, K., & Torres, M. (2016). *Challenge based learner user guide.* Digital Promise.

Organización de las Naciones Unidas. (2015, 25 de septiembre). *Transformar nuestro mundo: Agenda 2030 para el Desarrollo Sostenible.* http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO). (2014). *Hoja de ruta de la UNESCO para la Implementación del Programa de Acción Mundial sobre Educación para el Desarrollo Sostenible.* http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002305/230514e.pdf

Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura (UNESCO). (2017). *Educación para los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible. Objetivos de aprendizaje.* Ediciones UNESCO.

Parejo, J. y Cortón-Heras, M. (2025). Experiencias de aprendizaje fuera del aula universitaria: análisis de salidas de centros escolares innovadores. *Educación XX1, 28*(1), 213–234. https://doi.org/10.5944/educxx1.38276

Pérez, M. y Rodríguez, J. (Coords.). (2017). *Buenas prácticas docentes del profesorado universitario.* Octaedro.

Paricio, J., Fernández-March, A. y Fernández, I. (2019). *Cartografía de la buena docencia universitaria. Un marco para el desarrollo del profesorado basado en la investigación.* Narcea.

Pinto, J. y Soto, J. (2021). *Challenge-based learning: Un puente metodológico entre la educación superior y el mundo profesional.* Thomson Reuters Aranzadi.

Pizzolitto, A. y Macchiarola, V. (2015). Un estudio sobre cambios planificados en la enseñanza universitaria: origen y desarrollo de las innovaciones educativas. *Innovación Educativa, 15*(67), 111–134.

Porto, M., García, M. y Bolarín, M. (2024). Desarrollo profesional colegiado a partir de proyectos de innovación docente: una trayectoria compartida. *Cuaderno de Pedagogía Universitaria, 21*(40), 28–37.

Portuguez, M., & Gómez, M. (2020). Challenge based learning: Innovative pedagogy for sustainability through e-learning in higher education. *Sustainability, 12.* https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104063

Prabawani, B., Hadi, S., Zen, I., Afrizal, T., & Purbawati, D. (2020). Education for Sustainable Development as diffusion of innovation of secondary school students. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 22*(1), 84–97.

Redman, A., Wiek, A., & Barth, M. (2021). Current practice of assessing students' sustainability competencies: a review of tools. *Sustainability Sciences, 16*, 117–135. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-020-00855-1

Rekalde, I. y Mendia, A. (2020). La mentoría en el impacto académico del profesorado novel de la UPV/EHU. *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia), 46*(2), 191–213. https://dx.doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052020000200191

Rekalde-Rodríguez, I., Barrenechea, J., & Hernández, Y. (2021a). Ocean i³. Pedagogical innovation for sustainability. *Education Sciences, 11*(8). https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11080396

Rekalde-Rodríguez, I., Gil-Molina, P., & Cruz-Iglesias, E. (2021b). The IraunIK and IraunIR questionnaires: Assessment of transversal competencies for sustainability. *Journal of Teacher Education for Sustainability, 23*(1), 22–40. https://doi.org/10.2478/jtes-2021-0003

Rekalde-Rodríguez, I., Gil-Molina, P., & Cruz-Iglesias, E. (2023). Institutional teaching choreographies in education for sustainability in times of pandemic: the Ocean i³ project. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education, 24*(9), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-02-2022-0039

Rekalde-Rodríguez, I., Barrenechea, J., & Zinkunegi-Goitia, O. (2024). Sailing aboard the training ship Saltillo. An extracurricular experience in education for sustainable development. *Journal of Outdoor and Environmental Education.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s42322-024-00173-5

Rieckmann, M., & Bormann, I. (2020). *Higher education institutions and sustainable development: Implementing a whole-institution approach.* MDPI.

Rodríguez-Rodríguez, E. (2024). ¿Qué significa innovar en educación superior? Una aproximación conceptual. *Revista Innovaciones Educativas, 26*(40), 170–187. https://dx.doi.org/10.22458/ie.v26i40.4845

Roig-Vila, R. (Ed.). (2020). *La docencia en la Enseñanza Superior. Nuevas aportaciones desde la investigación e innovación educativas.* Octaedro.

Sabariego, M. (2024). *Análisis de datos cualitativos y el programa Nvivo 14. Dosier-Tutorial.* Universitat de Barcelona.

Sandín, M. (2003). *Investigación cualitativa en educación. Fundamentos y tradiciones.* McGraw Hill.

Schophuizen, M., & Kalz, M. (2020). Educational innovation projects in Dutch higher education: Bottom-up contextual coping to deal with organizational challenges. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(36). https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-00197-z

Thomas, G. (2011). *How to do your case study: A guide for students & researchers.* SAGE Publications.

Tierney, W., & Lanford, M. (2018). Institutional culture in Higher Education. In *Encyclopedia of international Higher Education systems and institutions.* Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-9553-1_544-1

Tomàs, M., Borrell, N., Castro, D., Feixas, M., Bernabeu, D. y Fuentes, M. (2010a). *La cultura innovadora de las universidades: estudio de casos.* Octaedro.

Tomàs, M., Castro, D. y Feixas, M. (2010b). Dimensiones para el análisis de las innovaciones en la universidad. Propuesta de un modelo. *Bordón, 62*(1), 139–151.

Vázquez, R., Picazo, M. y López-Gil, M. (2021). Estudio de casos e innovación educativa: un encuentro hacia la mejora educativa. *Investigación en la escuela, 105*, 1–10. https://doi.org/10.12795/IE.2021.i105.01

Zinkunegi-Goitia, O., & Rekalde-Rodríguez, I. (2022). Employability within an education for sustainability framework: The Ocean i³ case study. *Education Sciences, 12*(4).