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The Four Scholarships

by Charles E. Glassick

In Scholarship Reconsidered, Ernest Boyer reminds us that, Scholarship is not an esoteric appendage; it is at the heart of what the profession is all about, and to weaken faculty commitment to scholarship is to undermine the undergraduate experience, regardless of the academic setting. Yet, he noted, the Academy had evolved so that research and undergraduate teaching had become competing obligations, and Boyer believed that the priorities of the professoriate needed to be re-examined. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching undertook that quest.

Ernest Boyer, working very closely with Eugene Rice, proposed that the definition of Scholarship be expanded to include research and three additional forms of scholarly work - integration, application and teaching. The Carnegie Foundation publication Scholarship Reconsidered was, from the beginning, looked upon as a new vocabulary to discuss an important and serious issue in higher education, and the discussion began. Almost immediately, the term application became engagement and, slightly later, Shulman coined the scholarship of teaching and learning, which has replaced the scholarship of teaching.

In a later publication, Scholarship Assessed, we tried to define these four forms of scholarship: The first and most familiar element in this model—the scholarship of discovery—comes closest to what academics mean when they speak of research, although we intend that this type of scholarship also include the creative work of faculty in the literary, visual, and performing arts. The academy holds no tenet in higher regard than the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead. At its best, the scholarship of discovery contributes not only to the stock of human knowledge but also to the intellectual climate of a college or university. The process, the outcomes, and especially the passion of discovery enhance the meaning of the effort and of the institution itself.

The scholarship of integration makes connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces. Integration, the second of the four forms of scholarship, involves faculty members in overcoming the isolation and fragmentation of the disciplines. The scholarship of integration makes connections within and between the disciplines, altering the contexts in which people view knowledge and offsetting the inclination to split knowledge into ever more esoteric bits and pieces. Often, integrative scholarship educates non-specialists by giving meaning to isolated facts and putting them in perspective. The scholarship of integration is serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret.
From the Editor

The main focus of this issue is on scholarship as reframed by Ernest Boyer in his 1990 book ‘Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate.’ This work is having a significant effect on discussions about the work of an academic and some institutions are seeking to rewrite their promotion policies based on Boyer’s ideas. This is no easy task and so I thought, prompted by Christine Bruce, that a series of articles, which set out to explain the basic ideas, supplemented by reports from institutions that were attempting to operationalise the ideas, would be timely.

We are very fortunate to publish contributions from staff of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching who have been closely involved with Boyer’s work and it is valuable to get their North American perspective’s on the topics. It was also good to publish work from the University of Ballarat, one of the Australian universities attempting to put Boyer’s ideas into practice. I hope both the theory and practice will be useful for readers.

It has been good to respond to topical issues, which should be a feature of a newsletter, and so I was pleased to be able to receive Christine Asmar’s contribution which reflects upon Muslim students experiences in Australia following the horrific events of September 11, 2001.

The draft of Eidos Ideas Dossier No 16, posted on the ADSIG list, caused quite a debate and resulted in a rewrite of the article using the interactions on the list as a basis. At one stage I pondered whether there was going to be a need for some kind of editorial intervention but decided that healthy debate was more worthwhile. We get very little feedback normally about the News so when debate is sparked it is good to hear.

I am saddened by the passing of a very faithful and dedicated HERDSA member, Alan Prosser. Alan had a real heart for the work of the Society and an amazing store of knowledge about its past. He decided a few years back that there was a danger that valuable material in HERDSA News and HERDSA Conference proceedings would be lost to the academic community unless some form of listing was prepared. He therefore embarked on the task of indexing the News and the proceedings. He completed the News Index up to 1999 but was unable to complete the proceedings. The index can be found on the HERDSA web-site. Since he began this work there have been considerable advances in library technology so Christine Bruce and I are hoping in the next few months to use these advances to make the index more useful to the academic world. Alan was a good friend and a great encourager to me as editor. I shall miss him.

Roger Landbeck

Vale Allan Prosser

As we were about to go to press I heard of the death of Alan Prosser, one of HERDSA’S life members. There was no time to prepare an adequate tribute to his work so that will appear in the August edition. In the meantime we mourn the loss of a very dedicated member of the society and extend our condolences to his wife and family.

Roger Landbeck
Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application."

Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application.

consequential problems?" Historically, higher learning has been viewed as being useful, 'in the nation's service', quote as Woodrow Wilson put it. Yet this obligation to the larger society should go beyond Wilson's vision of educating future leaders. Colleges and universities also must respond to the issues of the day, following the model set in place more than a century ago by the land-grant colleges as they tried to meet the needs of the nation's farmers. Lessons learned in the application of knowledge can enrich teaching, and new intellectual understandings can arise from the very act of application, whether in medical diagnosis, exploration of an environmental problem, study of a design defect in architecture, or an attempt to apply the latest learning theories in public schools. Theory and practice interact in such ventures and improve each other.

The concepts provided by Carnegie were an immediate success. Scholarship Reconsidered became a Carnegie best seller and institutions worldwide began to consider the implications of this formulation of scholarship. Because the book was brief, because of the lack of jargon, conversations continued. But it was, indeed, the power of the ideas and, indeed, the right ideas at the right time, that fertilized the debate.

It soon became evident, however, that regardless of the appropriateness of the timing and correctness of the ideas, it would be difficult to integrate these new concepts into the faculty reward system. There were fears by some faculty that adopting a different model of scholarship might, in fact, impede their careers. In short, they were not willing to bet their promotion and tenure on some new concepts about scholarship. Other faculty were concerned about replacing the existing system of research followed by publication in a refereed journal. Although their concerns might be looked upon as simply being unwilling to change to a new model, it was Carnegie notes position that these scholars were, indeed, concerned that a new model might lower the standards of scholarly quality used in judging promotion and tenure.

This argument was looked upon with great seriousness at Carnegie. Boyer reminded us that Excellence is our only yardstick. Carnegie needed to look at the elements and characteristics of quality scholarship. This led to research, analysis and, finally, publication of Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. In an attempt to answer the essential question, Are there general standards now used for judging the quality of scholarly performance? Carnegie accumulated a voluminous file of documents including guidelines on hiring, tenure and promotion practices from dozens of colleges and universities. We also got responses from fifty-one granting agencies and from editors of thirty-one scholarly journals and the directors of fifty-eight university presses whom we asked about the standards used to decide the scholarly merit of proposals and manuscripts. In addition, we collected many of the forms that institutions provide to students and occasionally to faculty peers to evaluate college teaching.

The most remarkable feature of these various guidelines was not how much they contained that was unique, but the degree to which they shared elements. Carnegie found that it was possible to identify in these lists and guidelines a set of six shared themes. All works of scholarship, be they discovery, integration, engagement, or teaching, involve a common sequence of unfolding stages. Carnegie found that, when people praise a work of scholarship, they usually mean that the project in question shows that it has been guided by: (1) clear goals, (2) adequate preparation, (3) appropriate methods, (4) significant results, (5) effective presentation, and (6) reflective critique.

Once again, Carnegie provided a vocabulary for the debate to begin.

Lee Shulman made a major contribution to the clarity of, What is Scholarship? He assigned certain characteristics to all good scholarly work when he described attributes of the scholarship of teaching: "A scholarship of teaching will entail a public account of some or all of the full act of teaching, vision, design, enactment, outcomes, and analysis in a manner susceptible to critical review by the teacher's professional peers and amenable to productive employment in future work by members of that same community.

In addition, Robert Diamond added specificity by stating the following characteristics of scholarship (which are particularly useful when looking at faculty tenure and promotion documents): An activity will be considered scholarly if it meets the following criteria.

- The activity or work requires a high level of discipline-related expertise.
- The activity or work is conducted in a scholarly manner with:
  - Clear goals
  - Adequate preparation
  - Appropriate methodology

"Clarifying campus missions, relating the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life seem essential to our future strength."
Still, the debate continues. Many institutions have adopted the four forms of scholarship or some variation thereof, many institutions have retained peer review in the process, but others have found alternative ways of assuring quality. Although from the beginning Carnegie pointed out that this was not a put down of research, there are still those who are concerned about a possible reduction of research, particularly at the major universities. Yet, in a recent publication, it was stated that 80% of the publications are done by 37% of the faculty and that 90% of the publications, which are cited multiple times, were done by 10% of the faculty. Clearly, there is room for an expansion of a research commitment, even while other forms of scholarship are being adopted. Clearly there is no antagonism between a commitment to research and a commitment to integration, engagement and teaching.

Faculty Roles and Rewards—a scholarly conference led by Gene Rice and held annually under the auspices of AAHE—continues to prosper and shows the vitality of the debate on forms of scholarship. Higher education is evolving. Change is slow—as it should be—but inevitable. Clarifying campus missions, relating the work of the academy more directly to the realities of contemporary life seem essential to our future strength. If the world’s higher learning institutions are to meet today’s urgent academic and social mandates, their missions must be carefully redefined and the meaning of scholarship creatively reconsidered.
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The Scholarship of Integration: Making Meaning in a Post-Modern World

by Jerry Berberet

When the late Ernest L. Boyer coined the “scholarship of integration” in his landmark Scholarship Reconsidered (1990), he signaled a turning point in a debate about the nature of scholarship that originated with the nineteenth century partnership of empirical science and the research university as handmaidens of an industrializing modern society. As an incubator of increasingly specialized disciplinary knowledge, the research university fueled scientific breakthroughs that lay behind new understandings of nature and society and technological innovations in all fields of human endeavor from manufacturing, communications, health care, and food production to military might. Enjoying academic prestige and favored in the faculty reward system, this “scholarship of discovery” was extolled by some as the only true scholarship because it relied on empirically verifiable quantitative data gathered according to the tenets of “objective” and “value free” inquiry. Still, social and political discord within and without the United States beginning in the 1960’s raised questions for which science and specialization increasingly lacked answers. Enter Boyer who validated a scholarship designed to make sense of the parts in relation to the whole, consistent with the systemic thinking of a multi-cultural society making the transition from an industrial to an information age.

The scholarship of integration cannot be fully understood apart from Western intellectual traditions at least as old as Socrates, the contemporary relationship of faculty work and scholarship within the academy, and the needs and tensions of a changing society. In addition to his timing, Boyer’s genius lay in his grasp of the interaction of these influences. Although he never explained in detail what he meant by the scholarship of integration, he understood that important scholarly findings were occurring on and across the boundaries of the disciplines and that the integrity of undergraduate education depended on the ability to connect general and specialized learning. In advocating, as well, a “scholarship of
Bruce Kimball, has been a “conflicted tradition” (1996), especially prone to an intellectual dualism symbolized in the classical Greek division between Socrates quest for the “examined life” the received truths of Plato’s Republic. The Socratic method drew its truths from observation of human experience, truths relative to particular situations. Plato presented the opposite view, that truths are universal and reached through normative reasoning. Socrates, of course, paid dearly for his epistemology. Aristotle’s focus on virtues of reflective citizenship integrated elements of the Socratic and Platonic epistemologies. This cycle of dialectic thinking, pitting thesis against antithesis followed by synthesis, has revisited old issues and yielded new integrative perspectives over the millennia.

Thus, in advocating an empirical humanitarianism, Bacon and Descartes revived Socratic reasoning, undermined the universal truths of medieval scholasticism, and laid the foundation for the rise of modern science. When modern science became the stalking horse of a mechanistic positivism in service to industrialism during the late nineteenth century, John Dewey answered with pragmatism, connecting education and democracy through an epistemology based in community experience. Alfred North Whitehead made the case for holism this way, “You may not divide the seamless coat of learning” (1929). At different points in the twentieth century Robert Hutchins and Allen Bloom took up the Platonic mantle in arguing for a Western canon based on the Great Books. Indeed, the “culture wars” of the 1980’s and 1990’s in the humanities grew out of the interdisciplinary ferment that multi-cultural and women’s studies set in motion during the 1960’s and 1970’s. Scholars such as Bloom and National Endowment for the Humanities directors William Bennett and Lynne Cheney championed the conservative reaction in defense of the canon. Expect societal pressures to integrate the Islamic tradition into scholarly efforts to increase international understanding in the wake of the violent tragedies of September 11, 2001, and the war in Afghanistan.

Concerns about declining civility and citizen participation in American civic life, rising international violence and terrorism, decaying community infrastructures, and declining school performance in the face of educational expectations ratcheting up to meet complex information society needs illustrate the urgency of current efforts to advance liberal learning and integrative scholarship. Perhaps not surprisingly, John Dewey’s equation of education and democracy has enjoyed a revival, as illustrated in Campus Compact’s service learning initiative and the Society for Values in Higher Education’s models for democracy project. These programs link civic education in the curriculum with voluntarism and community engagement as thought-action strategies to educate for citizen responsibility.

Paralleling such efforts, the Kettering Foundation and others champion a public scholarship in which the scholar becomes a participant observer of community life. Seeking to model the democratic process being studied, the public scholar acknowledges a subjectivity arguably present in all research and attempts to integrate established research methodologies with new ways of reflecting authentically the values, language, reasoning, and behavior of members of the community in effect constructing a shared community scholarship with shared responsibility and shared consequences. A movement for a
established the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL) which has enrolled several hundred colleges and universities in the scholarly study of learning and pedagogy in and across the disciplines and has inspired countless faculty-student collaborative research undertakings. Programs such as CASTL, coupled with recent findings in cognitive research that underscore the importance of theory and practice (e.g., hypothothesizing and field testing, knowledge and applications) to achieve effective learning, have made teaching and learning a serious disciplinary scholarly enterprise for the first time.

Boyer followed Scholarship Reconsidered with another work Scholarship Assessed (1997), completed by colleagues posthumously, which asserted that all faculty work, including teaching and service, should be a form of scholarship susceptible to evaluation according to a common set of standards. In integrating multiple faculty roles under a scholarly mantle, Scholarship Assessed has taken a giant step toward infusing a scholarly mantle, Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.


In summary, it is worth noting that moments of ascendency for liberal education—its trademark holistic philosophy dedicated to education of the whole person and an integration of thought and action—have also been enriching occasions for the scholarship of integration. At these points, theoretical reasoning, narrative imagination, and empirical and participant observation have often been drawn together to support cross-disciplinary interpretations. Although Socrates paid with his life, the Socratic method has survived. Other scholarly tools developed over the ages have as well—syllogistic reasoning from the medieval disputation, the hypothothesizing and experimentation of the scientific method, pragmatism's exploration of context, the problem-based activism of the 1960's, feminist and multicultural exploration of difference, and the Plato, Hutchins, et al. quest for what is common in our heritage. The deconstructionism identified with French intellectuals Jacques Derrida and Michael Foucault, so harshly criticized at the height the culture wars, has deepened our attention to language in constructing meaning. Viewed through this historical lens, the scholarship of integration truly "stands on the shoulders of giants!"
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The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Idea and Impact

By Marcia Babb and Pat Hutchings

For the past five years, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has been working with faculty, campuses, and scholarly societies to foster a scholarship of teaching and learning that will 1) strengthen the learning of all students, 2) advance the practice and profession of teaching, and 3) bring to teaching the recognition and reward afforded to other forms of scholarly work in higher education.

This work is driven by both a problem and an opportunity. The problem is not that teaching is terrible, though certainly it could be better. The problem is that as a profession, and a practice, teaching has no way to improve itself. Carnegie president Lee Shulman has written about discovering, as a young faculty member, what he calls "pedagogical solitude," the fact that teaching, which one might expect to be the most social of work, is much more private than research (1993, p. 6). Indeed, teaching is lonely work for many faculty—work with a very underdeveloped set of habits and infrastructure for sharing what we do and know with colleagues, and for "building the field." This is especially distressing today, when so many faculty are doing innovative things in their teaching. The profession can't afford not to learn from the innovations and experiments by teachers who are trying new things.

Which brings us to the opportunity. Many faculty today are hungry for intellectual collegialship around teaching and learning. Many have been touched by the spirit (if not the sustained practice) of assessment and want to know whether some new thing they're trying is actually making a difference in the experience of students. They start looking more carefully at student learning—and at their teaching. And doing so turns out to be intellectually interesting—interesting enough to share with others and to think through in ways that hold water with colleagues—or maybe even to include in a promotion and tenure file. In short, an important shift occurs as faculty begin to think of their teaching and their students' learning as intellectual work that can be undertaken in a scholarly way, through inquiry, peer review, and contribution to a larger community of practice.

But this shift doesn't happen automatically, and the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL, as we call our program) is intended to make it happen faster, more widely, and with greater impact. We do this by working at three levels. Through CASTL's advanced study center on teaching, individual faculty ("Carnegie Scholars") investigate important issues in the teaching and learning of their field and do so in ways that others can build on. In turn, their work both contributes to and draws from work at the campus level, undertaken with Carnegie's partner, the American Association for Higher Education; there are now almost 200 campuses involved in this work, developing new policies and structures that support scholarly work on teaching and learning. Finally, CASTL works with disciplinary and professional societies to bring teaching and learning more visibly into the mainstream of scholarly life, through conferences, publications, "discourse communities," and the like.

Now, five years into this work, we're asking questions about how the scholarship of teaching and learning has "travelled" and become more embedded in higher education, what forms it takes, and its impact at various levels. And to answer these questions in a concrete way, we are developing a number of case studies. What follows here are brief versions of two such cases, focused on an individual faculty member and on a campus. The two cases both typify and specify the kinds of changes and developments we are now seeing.

A Historian Looks at Student Learning

David Pace, 1999-2000 Carnegie Scholar, is an associate professor of history at Indiana University Bloomington, a large doctoral institution in the midwestern region of the United States. David teaches and studies 19th- and 20th-century thought and culture. Although his interest in teaching and teaching communities dates back to the early 1970s, his understanding of the role of teaching within academia remained relatively traditional until the 1990s when he began to rethink the professional training of history graduate students and the challenges of fostering learning in large introductory courses.

Hoping to contribute to the national dialogue about student learning, David applied to the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in 1999. His proposed project was to create a typology of "reading operations" in history courses and to design methods for modeling those operations for students. His investigation was prompted by what he saw as students' inability to master some of the most basic tasks entailed in the reading of historical texts. They could not distinguish, for example, between interpretations of evidence used to support opposite positions. Because David found that he had trouble modeling this task and others for his students, he became convinced that the tasks were so much a part of his culture as a historian that he could not recognize exactly where students went wrong—and that what was therefore needed was a more carefully and explicitly articulated model of such reading operations. He then moved from articulating his own expectations to a broader study of the expectations of contemporary historians from many institutions. Until history faculty are clear about the skills they want students to perform and how to teach those skills, David is convinced, getting students to understand history will be very difficult.

David's research and application are progressing simultaneously—a condition he expects is common to many doing the scholarship of teaching and learning. Wanting to put his thoughts into practice, he is testing new models for basic
A Campus Begins to Transform its Culture

One of almost 200 campuses participating in CASTL’s Campus Program, Western Washington University (WWU) is an interesting example of impact at the campus level. A masters-level institution located in the northwest United States, WWU has embraced the agenda of the scholarship of teaching and learning in ways that helped to forge a common language about change and assisted the campus community to identify its core values for undergraduate learning. In a report on its progress prepared last summer for CASTL, Western identified three key areas of change influenced by the scholarship of teaching and learning: 1) general education curriculum reform, 2) lower division advising and community building, and 3) venues for student participation in the scholarship of teaching and learning.

In 1999, twenty-five faculty members from across the campus met to discuss "good teaching" and "scholarly teaching." They were concerned that Western's mission to provide a quality "good teaching" and "scholarly teaching." They were concerned that Western's mission to provide a quality undergraduate experience was not supported by attention to learning outcomes or reward structures. These campus conversations provided a baseline for reform initiatives. The simultaneous formation on campus of the Center for Instructional Innovation (CII) to provide faculty development opportunities helped to enrich and support the Campus Program. The two entities co-hosted open forums around a variety of teaching/learning issues, and CII created a web site profiling the Campus Program. What emerged from these efforts is a new structure, the Teaching and Learning Academy (TLA), with a core group of 60 faculty and students, and the participation of 200-450 faculty at Campus Program open forums. Western's president and provost support the Campus Program with funding for faculty development workshops, outside speakers, and faculty and student travel to conferences. A vice provost for undergraduate education position was recently created to provide new organizational support for the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Western Washington's program is notable, too, because it has made a conscientious effort to include a student voice. Nearly 200 undergraduates have enrolled in a special 2-credit seminar to join the conversation and inquiry about teaching and learning. Students have represented Western at national conferences to present the results of their participation in the Campus Program. Students also participated in a data-gathering rally last year in which they administered a questionnaire about learning experiences to nearly 600 peers on campus.

In concluding its recent progress report, Western notes that leadership in the Campus Program has come from grassroots faculty from all ranks and collegiate units. The report acknowledges that the main problem is criteria for tenure, promotion, and hiring that do not give sufficient weight to the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Looking Ahead

The two examples above are windows into the evolution of the scholarship of teaching and learning over the past five years. Lee Shulman recently predicted that “by 2005 there will be a fundamental recognition at colleges and universities in the United States that good teaching requires serious investigation into teaching and learning” (2000, p. 105). We will know, he says, if this recognition has occurred when campuses are supporting faculty investigations of their practice through teaching academies, financial support, changes in the reward structures governing tenure and promotion, and graduate programs that include the scholarship of teaching and learning. That’s a long-term agenda, but signs of progress are increasingly evident.

Teaching has traditionally been a practice that faculty learn by "the seat of
The promise of the scholarship of teaching and learning is that teaching might be more like other scholarly work, where we learn from colleagues and from those who go before, standing (as Sir Isaac Newton famously said) on the shoulders of giants.

References:

Marcia Babb manages the Carnegie Academy for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (CASTL). Among other responsibilities, she tracks and documents CASTL’s contributions to the development of the scholarship of teaching and learning. Previous work includes academic and technical programming for public and private-sector scholars from abroad, a grant program for US and overseas university partnerships, and teaching internationally.
Contact babb@carnegiefoundation.org

Pat Hutchings is vice president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, where she has led a major initiative on the scholarship of teaching and learning for the past five years. Previously, she directed programs on teaching and assessment at the American Association for Higher Education, and served as professor and chair of English at Alverno College. She has written and spoken extensively on the documentation and review of teaching and learning.
Contact hutchings@carnegiefoundation.org

The Scholarship of Engagement

by Lorilee Sandmann

Editors Note. Lorilee Sandmann was unable to write her article for this issue because of commitments but she kindly provided an abstract. Her article will appear in the August edition of HERDSA News.

NOTE. The Scholarship of Engagement is also known as the Scholarship of Application.

Abstract
A significant and growing number of universities across the United States are pursuing the agenda of public and civic engagement and giving serious consideration to resultant faculty roles. Along with new university commitment come new definitions of scholarship, including the scholarship of engagement. The scholarship of engagement continues to emerge and expand as campuses manifest context-driven characteristics reflecting the correspondence between their notion of scholarship and their individual history, priorities, circumstances, and location. However, from its earliest definition as scholarship, engagement has presented challenges to higher education. This article presents work that is national in scope and that addresses these challenges by providing faculty with institutional models and resources to advance the documentation, evaluation, and review of the scholarship of engagement.
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The Scholarship of Interaction

by Don Maconachie

Background

When, in rapid succession, the former Ballarat College of Advanced Education became Ballarat University College, and then, in 1994, the University of Ballarat, it assumed the complex of challenges associated with being a university. In the early 1990s, with the very idea of the university facing new types of contestation, making a success of being a new, small, regional university was a demanding task. However, the situation in Australia soon became even more difficult. By mid 1996, the post-Dawkins upheavals in Australian higher education had moved into a serious new phase in the wake of the first budget of the new Howard Government.

“David James argued that Boyer’s comprehensive view of scholarship provides a framework within which regional universities can ensure they fulfil all of the defining roles of a modern university.”

Facing multiple dilemmas, the leadership of the new University needed to take a long-term view and build for the future, but also had to deal with the shorter-term issues. There was a great need for a realistic, coherent and galvanising set of ideas and actions to deal with immediate concerns and set an effective and sustainable course for the future.

The new Vice Chancellor, Professor David James, arrived at the University of Ballarat in late 1994 with a strong and determined view that this new regional university should be of and for its region. Not long after commencing at Ballarat, he laid out his vision for a regional university. Drawing on and extending Ernest Boyer’s conception of the four scholarships (Boyer, 1990), David James sketched his view of how the University could both serve its regional community and participate effectively in the world of international scholarship. Outlining his idea of the key elements that characterise universities, David James argued that Boyer’s comprehensive view of scholarship provides a framework within which regional universities can ensure they fulfil all of the defining roles of a modern university and, in doing so, both draw from, and make significant contributions to, the social, cultural and economic development of their communities.

David James’s ideas on scholarship and regionality were further developed during 1996 through a major planning process involving the University Council, and a series of six Vice-Chancellor’s Forums, both of which were conducted as part of a comprehensive repositioning exercise that had commenced prior to, but was made more urgent by, the higher education budget cuts (Kemmis and Maconachie, 1998).

Adopting and Adapting Boyer

In a significant paper presented at a University Council planning workshop, Professor Stephen Kemmis, the newly appointed Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research), provided an interpretation of Boyer’s four interrelated scholarships that clearly resonated with most of the members of council and senior staff present.

He highlighted what Ernest Boyer wrote in 1990:

“What we urgently need today is a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar — a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice, and through teaching. We acknowledge that these four categories — the scholarship of discovery, of integration, of application, and of teaching — divide intellectual functions that are tied inseparably to each other. Still, there is value we believe, in analysing the various kinds of academic work, while also acknowledging that they dynamically interact, forming an interdependent whole. Such a vision of scholarship, one that recognises the great diversity of talent within the professoriate, also may prove especially useful to faculty as they reflect on the meaning and direction of their professional lives. (Boyer, 1990, pp.24-25)"

This paper urged those present to consider the four interrelated scholarships outlined by Boyer in something of a different light. It suggested that it is perhaps not too much of a disservice to Boyer to say that his four scholarships can be differentiated in terms of four kinds of practices (of communication, connection and production) relating members of the University community to one another and to people outside the University. He went on to explain what he meant in relation to each of the four scholarships:

The Scholarship of Discovery involves practices, social relationships and connections between people whose work constitutes the knowledge of a discipline, field or profession. For instance, it focuses on the practices of communication by which a thorough knowledge is gained of the state of the public record of a field — the existing knowledge of the field and the intellectual traditions that constitute it, and by which new contributions are added to that public record;

The Scholarship of Integration involves practices and social relationships connecting members of the university with people and groups in the wider community, for instance in contributing to contemporary debates in the wider public sphere constituted through the public media and the open communications of various kinds of networks and associations;

The Scholarship of Application involves practices of professional and community work and social relationships that, for instance, connect members of the scholarly community of the university with a wide variety of individuals, organisations and enterprises;

The Scholarship of Teaching involves practices of teaching and learning and relationships that connect teachers and students. For instance, it involves practices of communication that engage teachers and students in a permanent struggle with texts, takes an active view of teachers as lifelong students of their field and the practices of teaching, and takes an active view of students as constructors of knowledge and as the rising generation of scholars.“
The University's emerging interpretation of connected scholarship was further extended in the second half of 1996 through the six Vice-Chancellor's Forums. These Forums covered the following topics: student recruitment and retention, research and consultancy, courses and units, staffing and staff development, alliances and partnerships, and structures and functions. All of these constructively address the difficult problems of maintaining the University's emphasis on the quality of learning and teaching while also building a substantial research profile and developing a stronger research culture.

The new policy was welcomed by many staff, but not all. For those who wanted to develop their roles as academics in all four areas of scholarship, albeit not necessarily equally or simultaneously (Boyer talks about "seasons" in the careers of academics), the new environment offered new opportunities. The outcomes of several promotion rounds since 1997 provide evidence that such staff prospered under the new policy. On the other hand, a significant proportion of the staff contested the policy from the outset. Many of these staff argued that there was insufficient consultation before the adoption of the policy, the bases for the policy were unclear and possibly flawed, the policy changed the criteria for assessment, and it became too difficult to mount a successful case for promotion.

The policy has yet been formally evaluated so it is difficult to make a proper assessment of its impact. However, an insight into the views of Ballarat staff is provided by reading the Ballarat case study in the relatively recently published 

"There is no obvious reason why higher education staff and TAFE staff working together cannot very successfully engage in Boyer's four different kinds of scholarly practices."

Institutional Change
A key understanding that developed among proponents of the adoption and adaptation of Boyer's four interrelated scholarships at Ballarat was that scholarly communication and interaction are necessary to a satisfying and productive university life, and creating the conditions under which these could flourish would, all things being equal, help ensure the development of a vigorous institution. It was believed that a renewed emphasis on the academic practices of communication, connection and production—using Boyer's ideas as a catalyst—would see academic staff in the University increasingly turning towards and interacting with relevant people and groups, both to a greater extent and in increasingly productive ways.

A central idea was, it was hoped, an empowering one, at the heart of this process of development and change, that scholarly communication and interaction, within and beyond the institution, are ultimately the most important resources of a university. There was commitment to the view that even in the midst of scarce material resources, the cultural resources of academic practice are continuously produced and reproduced, and, if properly acknowledged and prioritised, can transform important aspects of the life of the university. Through the framework of the four scholarships, it was expected that, at least among groups in the University, the space would be created for a focus on scholarship that could develop into something that would make a real difference to individual careers, the University, and the community—locally, nationally and internationally.

The University of Ballarat has now moved on to new challenges that provide both new opportunities for, and new threats to, the development of its academic work and the framework of the four scholarships that has been the key theme of its progress as a university so far. In particular, the dramatic impact of becoming a dual-sector university, with a TAFE division approximately the same size as its higher education division, creates new dynamics of contestation and institutionalisation around the four scholarships. This very different type of institutional change may sound the death knell of Boyer at Ballarat. However, this need not be the case. Its new dual sector nature gives the University of Ballarat the potential to adapt the four scholarships even further and maintain this hard won framework as a continuing thread in its development as a regional university.
groupings of students, new types of problems requiring multi-disciplinary solutions, new interconnections between theory and practice, and new, wider public spheres.
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A more developed version of this interpretation of Boyer can be read in a discussion paper prepared for the University of Western Australia by Stephen Kemmis, Simon Marginson, Paige Porter and Fazil Rizvi (http://www.acs.uwa.edu.au/open_discuss/).

Experiences with Boyer's Four Scholarships within the School of Science at a small regional university.

by Martin E Westbrooke

Background

The Carnegie Foundations Report - Scholarship reconsidered: priorities for the Professorate (Boyer 1990) - argued for a broadening of roles and rewards in Higher Education. It argued that four aspects of scholarship be rewarded:

- Discovery
- Teaching
- Application
- Integration

The University of Ballarat evolved out of a merger between the State College of Victoria at Ballarat and the Ballarat Institute of Advanced Education to form the Ballarat College of Advanced Education which achieved independent University status in 1994. The legacy of this history was an emphasis on the role of teaching and, at the time of establishment, limited emphasis on discovery.

Ballarat is a small regional University with a strong commitment to support for regional issues and development of its region. Early in the development of the University a Council Working Party on developing scholarship, research and student life recommended adoption of Boyer’s Four Scholarships as a model for the future work of the University.

Within the School of Science the model was readily adapted since it reflected activities that had been the pattern for some time. As Head of School I had a strong belief in the valuable interaction and positive feedback that resulted from the integration of teaching and research in scientific disciplines. I also recognised the importance of application of scholarship to industry and community issues and integration with other disciplines and layers of education.

The School of Science had already moved towards an emphasis on applied sciences. The original BIAE offerings were the traditional disciplines of Physics, Chemistry, Geology and Metallurgy which reflected the origins of the College as the School of Mines Ballarat. At the time of merger, biological programs were developing at both antecedent institutions and instead of developing a conventional Biology program, strands in Food Technology and Environmental Management were established. In the early 1990s, with declining enrolments in Physics and Chemistry offerings were confined to the applied disciplines of Food Technology, Environmental Management and Geology/Metallurgy, all with a strong demand for graduates and established industry links.

The four scholarship model within the Centre for Environmental Management

The Centre for Environmental Management within the School of Science and Engineering provides good examples of the ways in which the four-scholarship model of Boyer reflected the ways in which the teaching program had developed within the emerging University of Ballarat. The Centre was established to focus the activity of a number of staff with diverse skills and research interests in environmental management into research and consultancy linked to the needs of industry and the community. The functioning of the Centre illustrates how integrated teaching, research and consultancy throughout the undergraduate and graduate programs. It also shows how this integration can serve important institutional strategic goals.

The underlying philosophy of the Centre is to skill students at all levels of study to become active, engaged participants in real-world, local environmental problems. During their first year of study students undertake a core first-year unit that includes a compulsory seminar program. This
weekly program includes presentations from both research students and ‘outsiders’ who speak about their approach to environmental problems and issues. Although first year students have as yet little specific disciplinary background, they nonetheless are expected to participate as future scientists who can learn from the models colleagues provide. Presenters are asked to highlight key research questions and the reasons underlying their approach. First year students cannot treat the seminar program lightly as they are required to reflect on the issues raised as part of their assessment. The seminar program is thus well established as part of the undergraduate and departmental culture. Over the three-year basic degree students have the opportunity to participate in about 60 such seminars.

In their third year all students complete a major independent research project which counts for 25 per cent of their total assessment. A prior unit in research methods provides the framework for them to complete a research proposal. While carrying out the project they frequently link directly with the industries and people who provided ideas for the projects. The School encourages publication of the projects. Most are published as short papers or reports. This approach is not without its difficulties. The judgement of the success of the project follows the criteria established by Glassick et. al. (1997) i.e. Clear goals, appropriate methodology, significant results, effective communication and reflective criticism.

Despite the University of Ballarat being a relative latecomer to University status, within the School of Science, 25 per cent of undergraduates typically enter the Honours program. This enrolment happens despite the excellent work prospects of graduates with a three-year degree. Many Honours students receive small industry grants of up to $2000 to complete their projects. Because the student project may not have outcomes of direct benefits to industry, industry sees this funding more as a donation to the School than an investment in research (Westbrooke & MaceLean 1999). Joint supervision between field staff and University staff can be a complicated process as the goals of the field staff are not necessarily congruent with those approved by the University in the proposal. Nonetheless, findings of use to industry do emerge from Honours projects and thus bring benefits to all partners—student, staff, and industry. The School’s strong industry links, including major research and consultancy projects with tight requirements and outcomes are responsible for these additional small student grants.

The Centre for Environmental Management is involved in many projects/consultancies with industry, including major State agencies, such as Parks Victoria and the Department of Natural Resources and Environment, for whom it conducts specific research and consultancy projects. These include, for example, habitat assessments to provide guidelines for redistributing populations of native animals such as koalas, investigating the impacts of high kangaroo populations on regeneration of native vegetation and methods of remotely sensing vegetation and park integrated things that were fundamentally important to our discipline. It fits the perspectives of industry and the University while catering for the diverse activities in which we are engaged.

All academic staff have opportunities to teach in their own research interest areas and are encouraged to develop their approaches to teaching. Whilst there are undoubted pressures on staff there are opportunities for them to upgrade their approaches to teaching through research. Despite views to the contrary (e.g. Hattie & Marsh 1996) I believe that in a framework of applied science teaching there are benefits to teaching from academic staff being involved in related applied research. All types of scholarship have value for the School and its staff and assist in meeting the strategic goals of the University to develop strong community and industry links. Consequently staff are well placed to demonstrate their achievements for promotion. A potential problem for some staff however is the expectation of the University that they demonstrate performance in all four of Boyer’s scholarships in promotion applications. This matter needs to be addressed in a review of the promotion policy.

The scholarships of Teaching, Discovery and Application are readily understood and demonstrated. The scholarship of integration involves making links across disciplines and placing findings in a specialist discipline within a wider context. An aspect of this is demonstrated in Environmental Management where the disciplines of Botany, Zoology, Ecology and Soil Science are integrated to solve practical management issues which may also involve financial, social, political and ethical considerations. It is also reflected in an active program of involvement of post-graduate research students linking with secondary school students to help instil an interest in tertiary science courses.

An administrative restructure at the University in October 2001 led to the merger of the Schools of Science and Engineering. Despite the wide range off disciplines represented there are many synergies and I look forward to the four scholarship model being a key theme in the development of the new school.
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The Australian Awards for University Teaching 2001

The ceremony for the fifth annual Australian awards for university teaching was held in Old Parliament House, Canberra on Tuesday 4th December 2001. It was preceded by a National Teaching Forum. The forum provided an opportunity for all the finalists to give 15 minute presentations on their own reflections of 'Best Practice Teaching.' As you would expect there were some exciting presentations. Unfortunately the papers are not yet available on the AUTC website, www.autc.gov.org.

In addition to these presentations there were progress reports from the current AUTC funded projects. These projects are:

- Teaching Large Classes. (Presented by Desi Chalmers, Ron Weber and Debra Herbert from the University of Queensland).
- Flexible Learning Project. (Presented by Ron Oliver from Edith Cowan University, John Hedberg and Sandra Wills from the University of Wollongong).
- Finally there were reports from the five AUTC discipline-based projects in the Arts, Biotechnology, Business, Information Communication Technology and Nursing.

Some detail of all these projects are available on the AUTC website but this is not up to date. Each project has its own website and it is best to go there for more detailed information. For example, see www.tedi.uq.edu.au/largeclasses for the Teaching Large Classes project.

In this issue we publish first a paper by one of the finalists, Professor Iain Hay from Flinders University, who presented his thoughts about best practice teaching in the form of a letter to a new university teacher which was a very novel and interesting approach. Then there is a report by Jan Orrell, a member of the team from Flinders University, which won the institutional award for their programme, the Foundations of University Teaching. Jan is also a member of the HERDSA Executive Committee and we offer her our congratulations.
Dear Lee

I’m delighted to hear that you’ve completed your doctorate and that you are taking up an academic appointment in January. There is no doubt that your PhD is a fine scholarly work but, as you lament in your last letter, the efforts you have put into it are unlikely to have prepared you for the peculiar demands of a university teaching career.

You asked me if I might be able to offer you some advice on teaching well. I’m flattered by your request and am happy to offer some comments.

For me there are three simple, important, and sometimes overlapping keys to good teaching. I’d sum these up as engagement, enthusiasm and organisation. You might remember them as EEO!

I think engagement is one of the most important things to take to your teaching Lee. I mean engagement in the sense of ‘connection’, ‘communication’ and ‘commitment’.

I have to be engaged with and earnest about the material I teach. Sometimes this has been easy and other times very confusing because I find that my life as an academic is a voyage of ongoing self-discovery. In thinking about my research and about my teaching – indeed in thinking about my entire academic role – I’m haunted incessantly by questions like “why is this important?”, “what’s the point?”, “who cares about this?” and “what difference am I making?”. Although the self-doubts that have accompanied these incessant questions have nearly driven me to resignation, the questions and the struggle to find some resolution to them keep me connected to research, committed to teaching, and conscious of the concerns of many students. In fact, I am coming to see that for me, self-doubt and self-discovery are critical to the engagement I regard as a key to successful teaching! After about twenty years of teaching, I’m now beginning to realise that I have to live with those haunting questions rather than exorcise them. I hope your ghosts are just as supportive Lee.

Although it was hidden away a little, you might have gathered that I try to connect my research with my teaching – and vice versa. And where possible, I try to weave these together with community service and sometimes even with university administration. For instance, my experiences on an ethics committee at Flinders led me to teach and write about research ethics (for example, Hay 1998a; Hay 199b; Hay & Foley 1998). That work was illuminated by a different light when I was Council member of the Institute of Australian Geographers, an organisation I encouraged to think harder about ethics. I’ve found that teaching, research, administration, and community service can sometimes invigorate each other. It helps to keep them connected.

Engaging with students means recognising their different backgrounds and learning styles and trying to give class material personal significance. I’ve tried to do this by using wide varieties of teaching, learning and assessment methods and by paying close attention to, and trying to respond to, the ways in which individuals react to particular types of lesson or exercise. By recognising differences, employing a variety of teaching strategies, and trying to give class material personal significance I think we can spark enthusiasm and organisation. You might remember them as EEO!

Engagement also involves ‘empathy’. Every so often I try to recall or understand what it is like to be a first-year student in a class of a hundred or a thousand or to be gazing remotely in East Timor at a set of online instructional materials. Although this gets more and more difficult as the gap of time from my own formal experiences as a student increases I’ve found it helpful to sit in on other people’s lectures trying to take notes and recalling, for instance, how time travels when you are a member of the audience; why activity breaks can be important part-way through a 50 minute lecture; and how anecdotes can be powerful teaching devices.

I’ve also tried to maintain conversations with students. Its essential to be available to students, to visit study rooms in the Library and the department to find out what is on students’ minds. A terrible tendency I’ve noticed as conditions have become worse at universities and lecturers have started to hide in offices or at home is that more staff have begun to depersonalise or dehumanise students. Whatever happens Lee, don’t do that. If you keep up the conversation I think you’ll always remember that students are thinking, feeling people who do want to learn!

There’s another form of engagement that I’d like to set out here too Lee. You might recall some papers published by geographers (Angus et al 2001; Hay 2001; Heyman 2001; Wall 2001) earlier this year took up the notion that classrooms are an arena in which broad processes of injustice may be expressed and played out. Classrooms are places of political and social significance connected intricately and widely to our broader communities. Each of us needs to recognise this engagement Lee and make sure that the places we can most directly affect – such as offices, tutorial rooms and lecture halls – are not places in which practices of injustice are perpetuated. I think part of being a good teacher involves trying to make classrooms model sites of intellectual and social emancipation. While I don’t know how successful I’ve been in this area, I’d like to think that I’ve gone some way through a variety of strategies like peer writing groups (Hay & Delaney 1994); using the Web to encourage students to publish their work (see GEOView at http://www.ssn.flinders.edu.au/geog/GEOView.html); by asking small groups of Honours students to teach one another about philosophical and methodological issues in geography; and by encouraging geographers to think and write about other ways we can set up our classes for ‘revolutionary engagement’ (Curran & Roberts 2001; Peace 2001). It’s a big ask Lee, but
try connecting your classes and your lessons to a better world. I think it is also imperative to be enthusiastic about teaching. Teaching is probably more about conveying passion for a subject and helping to ignite intellectual fires than it is about conveying information.

I've found that enthusiasm is contagious. It does a university good. Enthusiastic staff encourage enthusiastic students who revitalise classrooms. For instance, I can recall the effects of a seminar presented by a new PhD graduate some 10 years ago. Stan Stevens was one of UC Berkleys top graduates of the 1980s and his talk was the most contagiously energetic I have ever attended. Although the details of his research were somewhat obscure and certainly not related to any of the work members of the audience were undertaking, more than thirty postgraduate students left that presentation as hell-bent on producing exemplary work of their own as I'd ever seen them. For me, the details of Stan's message have now been forgotten but his passion continues to inspire me. I find that I have to reach back to moments like that sometimes as I struggle to avoid the contagion of cynicism that occasionally creeps from colleagues' offices. I won't speculate on the roots of the deep pessimism and dispiritedness (for a discussion, see Kearns 2001; Hay, Foote & Healey 2000) that seems increasingly to permeate our universities, but I will implore you to avoid letting it dishearten you. Continue to associate with people who, like you, are optimistic, cheerful and full of good ideas. Be sure you find time to have coffee, lunch or a day with other enthusiasts whose imaginations and critical faculties can fly freely with yours. Find colleagues who will support and encourage you. Leave the hardened cynics to flock together.

The final key to success in teaching is, I think, organisation. This is important at a number of levels: in classes; in day-to-day time management; and in personal life.

In getting organised, I've found it helpful to prepare comprehensive topic handbooks and other learning aids for students. First, I realised that many students might be able to focus their attentions on substantive academic issues if they actually had a clear idea of the cues and conventions of academic communication. So, I wrote a 'student survival manual' for our Department which set out advice on writing essays, reports, drawing maps, referencing, passing exams and so on. Although this idea was nothing too new, that material turned into two very successful books, now in their second editions (Hay 2002; Hay, Bochner & Dungey 2002). Later, I moved on to producing my lecture notes in booklet form, which I give to students on the first day of class. I did this when I realised that it would probably be more productive to run some of the lecture sessions in a 'research methods' class as conversations. I was a little concerned that attendance would dwindle, but it turns out that it didn't and the notes eventually provided the framework for another book (Hay 2000).

Following on from this Lee, I've found that being organised in my teaching brings an added, and perhaps counterintuitive, benefit. Rather than imposing a rigid structure on teaching, being well-organised supports unanticipated opportunities for discussion without denying students access to programmed learning. For instance, by valuing pre-lecture reading for students and by preparing detailed lecture handouts for the class, I have found that students are well-informed and free participants in what are often often rewarding and enlightening discussions.

But for me Lee, organisation for good teaching can't be confined to the classroom and topic guides and student exercises. I think if you want to be a good teacher, you need to be sure that you've found ways to balance your professional and personal commitments. Increasingly, I'm finding it vital to dedicate about one uninterrupted day each week to research, writing or personal, professional reflection - fundamental parts of my professional identity. When I can't block out opportunities to do that work, I feel that other facets of my professional existence are conspiring to 'steal' research time. But when I do get those moments I feel much better and find that I am better prepared to teach with commitment, connection and enthusiasm.

Well, there's not too much here is there Lee. After twenty-odd years in a range of teaching roles in three different countries, I find it both perplexing and comforting that I can more or less sum up some of my key insights on good teaching in the three words, engagement, enthusiasm, and organisation. In some ways I would have thought there was more. I guess there is. There's a whole range of specific, day-to-day practices that might be attached to these notions (see, for examples, Booth & Hyland 2000; Gold et al. 1991; Kilfen 1998) but I do think that if you keep these three principles close to your heart and look for ways of bringing them to life in your classes and in other relationships with students, you'll find success in university teaching.

Yours sincerely.

Iain
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National Award Recognises Flinders University’s Efforts to Induct New Academics to their Teaching Role Or Sifting Through 101 ways to spend $50,000!

By Janice Orrell
graduates with signed certificates.

The development of the programme itself engaged the full spectrum of the university community. It was based on research evidence about induction programs for new academics and was validated through interviews and focus groups with recently appointed academic staff. In addition advice was sought from experienced academic developers in other Australian universities especially University of Western Australia and Queensland University and faculties were consulted.

The significance of the award for HERDSA members is that it acknowledges the significant contribution of centrally coordinated academic development to the quality of teaching in universities. Concurrent with this acknowledgement is recognition of the worth of educational developers who profess the discipline of higher education and recognition of their institution-wide role.

**Award Criteria**

Eligibility for the AUTC Institutional Awards required evidence of the extent to which the project or programme promotes or facilitates quality teaching and learning in the institution and assists staff to develop effective teaching and learning strategies. The call for applications asked for a commentary on the innovation coupled with practicality in the program. In addition, evidence of utilisation by intended clients and their degree of satisfaction had to be provided. Flinders University submitted evaluations from each of the seven cohorts that have completed the program, as well as arranging for responses to a survey adapted from the standard AUTC survey form for individual applicants. This latter survey was sent to the more than hundred staff who have completed the program and to their supervisors, requesting that their responses be sent directly to the award organisers at DETYA for processing.

This evidence demonstrated that Flinders University Foundations of University Teaching program:

- Encouraged new teachers to begin all teaching activities with a consideration about how students learn and the contextual factors that might need attention in order to promote successful learning.
- Assisted new teachers to articulate their own tacit assumptions about teaching, learning and assessment and to evaluate these in the light of key learning theories and research.
- Provided practical resources and social support for new teachers.
- Encouraged and enables networking amongst peers and with more experienced, successful academics.
- Grounded the new learning in ‘just in time’ policy and ‘just in time’ concepts.
- Utilised and further developed the University’s existing expertise, structures and supports.
- Seeded innovations in the participants’ teaching teams.

Feedback from 1998/2001 Participants included these comments:

- The most useful aspects of participation in Foundations of University Teaching were...
- Contact with other colleagues outside my discipline.
- Opportunity to reflect on my own practice.
- Flexibility to choose most relevant courses, great to develop a net work of people beyond one’s own school.
- Working out that my problems were being experienced by others.
- Clarifying my own goals.
- Making contact with the staff in Training and Development, and meeting a wide range of colleagues form different departments and faculties.
- Meeting other academics. Being taught the ‘basics’ of university teaching.
- Very useful to start off with the intensive workshop to kick-start the semester.
- Advice that I could offer a newly appointed academic in relation to Foundations of University Teaching is...
- Go with an open mind and benefit form the experience and support of others.
- Make sure you make the time to attend, its worth it.
- View it as a positive opportunity to network, develop skills and knowledge or even just a refresher to motivate reflection of practice.
- Fully utilise the courses on offer.
- Do the course and enjoy it, it is not a “hoop” to jump through.

**Program Description:**

In principle, the Flinders Foundations of University Teaching program:

1. Is influenced by faculty-based perceived needs and oriented to faculty requirements;
2. Is flexible enough to address the differing needs of the participants;
3. Utilises the skills and expertise of academics in the university who are known to be highly successful teachers;
4. Encourages cross disciplinary dialogue and collaboration;
5. Provides continuity of support in the first years;
6. Incorporates and models the university’s policies of equity and valuing diversity;
7. Is highly interactive and practical;
8. Incorporates a system of feedback and review, such that it is possible to assess year by year the level of participation in, and the effectiveness of, this program. This review involves both participants and their supervisors.
9. Recognises that staff enter with a wealth of experience related to teaching and learning in a university.

The teaching strategies in the program aim to be:

- Practical to provide new academic teachers with resources to assist them to plan for, and conduct, their first weeks of teaching.
- Reflective, enabling participants to begin to identify and review their tacit beliefs and assumptions about teaching and learning.
- Model diverse approaches, such that what is taught is modelled. Teaching about lectures is given as a lecture, teaching about tutorials is done in a tutorial, they experience independent learning on-line, staff assess and grade student work and evaluate the teaching they experience.
- Flexible in that they are designed and delivered in negotiation with participants and their supervisors.
- Interactive, providing opportunities for group work and exchange of ideas between participants.
- Engage with all areas of the University, in which senior administrators, library, student support and study skills services all contribute to the program.
- Self critical and adaptive incorporating a system of feedback and review is incorporated, such that it is possible to assess year by year the level of participation in, and the effectiveness of this program of induction to university teaching at Flinders. This review involves both participants and their supervisors.

The program is delivered in two parts. Part One: The Theoretical Foundation. This is a four day core component in
Part Two: Elective program

This section consists of seven elective sessions that can be taken over a twelve-month period. These sessions address the participants' specific. Reflections on Teaching workshop is held each non-teaching period. This workshop has an open agenda and attempts to address the pressing issues new staff are currently confronting in their teaching and to enable them to provide each other with continuing support. At least on is attended by Professor Edwards at which she strives to develop a first hand understanding of how new staff experience the University environment and the extent to which relevant policies are functioning successfully.

Other possible elective inclusions in the seven elective sessions are:

1. AOU's and Faculty Programmes: Some AOU's and Faculties conduct their own induction and education development programs programmes related to teaching their specific discipline.

2. IT for Teaching: These include will attendance at a 'hands on' workshops on using PowerPoint for lectures, WebCT for Topic Design, Interactivity or Computer-based Assessment.

3. Professional Development in Teaching: This includes, a time management for academics course, a developing a teaching portfolio workshop.

4. Early Career Researchers Workshop: This inclusion recognises the relationship that ought to exist between teaching and research in a university.

5. Independent Study: Staff can identify particular issues they wish to address and be directed to resources that will inform them on the topic. Once they have independently explored the issue they then outline, in a discussion, how they will incorporate the ideas into their teaching.

6. Mentoring in Teaching: Participants can request that an experienced teacher observes their teaching and provides constructive guidance. Once again, they then outline how they will incorporate suggestions to improve teaching and learning in their classroom or topic.

All that remains now is to develop a project to the tune of $50,000 to further enhance the quality of teaching at Flinders. That will be another story. But for an institution that has taken the risk of running a highly organic and integrated programme, this award has been very satisfying and exciting to receive and has reinforced its acceptance and utilisation within our learning community. The program has now be very successfully opened to general staff who contribute to the development and organisation of work-based learning, clinical teaching and computer mediated learning.

The Programme is coordinated and taught by Janice Orrell, Academic Coordinator and administered by Fran Banytis in the Staff development and Training Unit. The core teaching team includes Robyn Najar, Lecturer in the University Study Skill Unit and Ms Judith Condon Lecturer Health Sciences. Sessional contributors include Professor Anne Edwards, Vice Chancellor; Hugh Kearns, Head of Staff Development and Training Unit; David Green, Educational Designer; Flexible Delivery, Ms Libby Cooper, Head of Health and Counselling Unit; Multimedia technology Unit, and the Central Library.

Jan Orrell is Academic Coordinator in the Staff Development and Training Unit at Flinders University and a member of the HERDSA Executive.

Contact: janice.orrell@flinders.edu.au
Conferences July 2002

This year the annual conference of HERDSA will be preceded by the 4th World Conference of the International Consortium for Educational Development in Higher Education (ICED) to be held at the University of Western Australia from the 3rd to the 6th July.

Educational developers from all over the world will gather for the conference, which will provide a great opportunity for HERDSA members to enjoy interaction and discussion with them. Owen Hicks, a past President of HERDSA and convenor of the conference, has written an article about the conference which we hope will encourage more members to take advantage of this opportunity to meet with international colleagues.

Coralie McCormack, Andrellyn Applebee and Peter Donnan are hoping some members will get involved in an online discussion about online student evaluation of teaching, which will lead up to their paper at the conference. Their article gives a background to begin the discussion.

Finally Jan Orrell and Allan Goody would like to invite readers interested in Foundation of University Teaching programs to attend their conference workshop on the topic for which they provide a brief outline.

ICED - that’s ‘I said’ ok, not ‘iced’!

By Owen Hicks

ICED, the International Consortium for Educational Development, was established in 1993 to promote educational or academic development in higher education world-wide. ICED is a network whose members are themselves national organisations or networks concerned with promoting good practice in higher education. HERDSA is a member. The ICED Council is formed by presidents, or their representatives, of a country’s academic staff development network(s). While it costs nothing to join ICED, the consortium has no money so member organizations, or individual representatives, fund their own involvement. The current Chair of the ICED Council is Professor Pat Rogers, Dean of Education, University of Windsor, and Past-President of Canada’s Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. There are fifteen member organizations from Asia, Australasia, Europe, North America and the United Kingdom, and a number of associations from other parts of the world that have a passing involvement. One of the challenges for ICED is to get support to networks in countries where funding restrictions make international representation difficult.

ICED holds a world conference biennially. Past conferences have been held in Finland, the USA and Germany, with themes respectively of Preparing University Teachers; Supporting Educational, Faculty and TA Development within Departments and Disciplines; and Scholarship and Professional Practice in Academic Development. The next conference is in Perth, Western Australia, and the theme is Spheres of Influence: Ventures and Visions in Educational Development. More of that later.

The Council of ICED meets annually and, in the year when there is no conference, the meeting is usually supplemented with workshops for Council members and local educational developers. Council meetings are a fascinating United Nations-like environment, where the spoken language is mostly English, understandings and misunderstandings are seemingly inevitable, and strong international bonds are formed. Lessons are learnt about the state and context of academic development in one’s own country that could only be appreciated by contrast to scenarios presented by people from other corners of the world. Last year the Council met in Madrid. Council workshops were held on topics such as ‘developing international collaboration’ and ‘commonalities and differences in educational development’. The First Workshop for Spanish Educational Development Staff was run by RED-U (the Spanish association) with presentations from ICED councilors from Australia, Belgium, Canada and Norway (in spoken English but with Spanish overhead transparencies and handouts). My presentation was titled Liderazgo del Cambio Educativo! How’s your Spanish? And I would have to say the dinner beside the ancient Roman viaduct in Segovia was fantastic!!

The International Journal for Academic Development, published by Routledge, is the journal of ICED, enabling staff and educational developers around the world to debate and extend the theory and practice of academic development. Discount subscriptions are available to HERDSA members!! Contact the HERDSA Office for details. The journal looks for papers from people like us!

ICED assists with the development of emerging national networks. The Spanish workshop was an example of such work. Workshops for the emerging Universitas Network in Croatia provide another recent example.

HERDSA is one of the largest and most developed associations in ICED. Its publications have been highly regarded in many parts of the world. Compared with many nations represented we have a small population and a young but well developed higher education system. The focus on teaching and learning in Australian universities is seen internationally as progressive and positive. The extent to which academic
A National Colloquium on Foundation of University Teaching Programs

by Allan Goody and Jan Orrell

Over the past year we (Allan Goody and Janice Orrell) have shared our experiences in designing and teaching the Foundations of University Teaching programs in our respective Universities. We identified that we have developed both similar and quite different effective and innovative practices. The sharing of these has lead us both to further development and critical scrutiny of what we do. Through this exploration of both programs we became aware of the opportunities that might be generated through collaboration across the university sector among those who are responsible for programs inducting new academic staff to their teaching role and who provide support for them across the early years. Since then it has been our goal to facilitate a colloquium within the sector. Our goals are to

- identify and share innovations within the program operations,
- further develop a theoretical view of learning to teach at university
- create ongoing opportunities for collaboration, investigation and theorising
- consider the interface between Foundations programs and Graduate Certificates
- explore issues of transportability between institutions.

As an initial step towards sectoring collaboration we will jointly facilitate an interactive workshop at the upcoming HERDSA conference in Perth. It is our intention to conduct a literature review regarding Foundation programs and the induction of new academics that we would like to make available before the conference. Those who intend to participate are encouraged to:

- approach either one of us for the review and further information prior to the conference
- bring along information and resources regarding their own programs for sharing.

During the HERDSA workshop we will consider and plan for a national 2 day workshop at a later date that will focusing primarily on the management, teaching and scholarship of Foundation of University Teaching Programs. It would be an opportunity to identify and develop initiatives for collaborative development and research.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Contact:
Agoody@csd.uwa.edu.au
janice.orrell@flinders.edu.au
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Dr Allan Goody University of Western Australia,
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[Lifting the Lid/Inching the lid off/Time to lift the lid on] a can of worms: Initiating a conversation about the ethics of online student evaluation of teaching.

By Coralie McCormack, Andrelyn Applebee and Peter Donnan

Teaching online is part of the everyday practice of many academics and student evaluation of that teaching is an expected activity of both individuals and institutions. Increasingly, this expectation will demand ethical evaluation practices open to critical scrutiny, an approach more likely to ensure sustainable quality improvement frameworks within institutions over the long-term. Yet, conversations about the ethical practice of online student evaluations of teaching are rare. The purpose of this article is to begin such a conversation.

Setting the Scene for the Conversation

Teaching online is part of the everyday practice of many academics and student evaluation of that teaching is an expected activity of both individuals and institutions in today’s higher education context. Students’ perceptions of teaching now contribute to judgements about the quality of teaching and to decisions about promotion and funding. In this context Neumann (2000) predicts institutions will come under “increased scrutiny on issues such as sound evaluation practices” (p.121). Ethical evaluation practices open to critical scrutiny — an approach more likely to ensure sustainable quality improvement frameworks within institutions over the long-term — are an integral element of such sound practices.

That higher education institutions face issues with ethical dimension has been widely recognised (see for example, Loveluck, 1995; Margetson, 1997; Melrose, 2001; Murray, et.al., 1996). For example, the need for staff development sessions on the ethical aspects of good teaching has been noted by Melrose (2001). However, few academic conversations have addressed ethical practice when student evaluation of teaching goes online. Overseas, the potential importance of such conversations has been flagged by Theall (2000) when he suggests that putting student rating systems online “may create massive problems in the areas of confidentiality and privacy” (p.3 of 5). In the Australian context, Cummings & Ballantyne (2001) also suggest confidentiality as a challenge for online evaluation of teaching using student questionnaires.

While questionnaires can provide information about student learning online, information can also be gathered from other sources such as emails, discussion groups, chat rooms and online focus groups. Conversations about student evaluation of online teaching inclusive of this diverse group of evaluation activities are rare. It is timely then, to initiate a conversation structured around questions such as: Is student evaluation online different from, or similar to, evaluation in other contexts? What ethical considerations are raised when evaluation goes online? What further ethical issues arise when online evaluations are used for research and publication? and What constitutes ethical practice in this context?

This article will begin such a conversation by sharing an online discussion that occurred recently between three colleagues — Gung Ho, Con Servative and Ima Fencesitter — as they began to think through the issues raised by the first of the above questions.

Beginning the Conversation

Gung Ho (6/02): Since that faculty meeting we all attended last week I have been thinking about the question 'Is student evaluation online different from, or similar to, student evaluation in other contexts?' I think my answer is ‘YES, it is different’. It’s not the purpose that is different, but what happens under the banner of evaluation that forms the core of the difference.

The purpose is the same no matter what the context. So as Robert Cannon suggests evaluation is "an important part of the process of learning; it is about learning from our students, and their learning, and learning about our teaching" (2001, p. 86). As "good teachers our learning is on-going, we are constantly seeking feedback from students. Evaluation is not only the distribution and collection of standard questionnaires at the end of semester, but rather, involves on-going collection of information from a variety of sources using a variety of approaches.

I would suggest that online evaluation is different from offline evaluation in the following ways:

* who can participate (online all enrolled students can participate, in the more 'traditional' contexts only those attending the session where the evaluation occurs can participate and you know what happens when the 'when' is the last lecture of the semester!),
* where they are when they participate (offcampus or at least not within the confines of the four walls of a traditional classroom),
* greater variety of the methods available to collect information (e.g. emails, discussion boards, chat rooms as well as the more traditional methods of questionnaires and focus groups),
* quantity of information (more information by orders of magnitude),
* type of information (real time conversations for example),
* timing of the collection (more likely to be ongoing throughout the semester),
* depth and richness of information collected (more likely to include reflection in-action as well as reflection on-action),
* role of the context in which the information is collected (more likely be collected as part of student interaction or student/lecturer interaction rather than as an individual response to a purposely constructed 'evaluation instrument'), and
methods we use to analyse the information collected (more complex methods such as discourse analysis are possible).

And I think these differences create ethical issues related to collection, storage, and ongoing access to the information. The researcher in me is raising big red flags about confidentiality, anonymity, and informed consent. I'm feeling like if we continue this conversation we will be opening a can of worms! What do you think?

Con Servative (07/02) Hello Gung and Ima.

Responding to your recent posting Gung, I would say that good teaching in good teaching in any environment and the same applies with evaluation. So my view is that student evaluation online is the same as evaluation in other contexts. While I agree that evaluation is about improving student learning I would confine evaluation data to explicit, formally agreed upon sources of information. My response then to each of the differences you raise is as follows.

Participation: you imply that online evaluation will result in higher rate of evaluation responses because attendance in some on-campus classes towards the end of semester may be diminished. Without any direct evidence, my perception is that staff working in Evaluation Units in dual mode universities would generally acknowledge higher return rates from on-campus classes in the same setting compared with online students, unless other incentives are offered.

Location of students: whether students are in class, at home, or at a computer terminal is not generally a significant defining issue. Group dynamics for instance may be operative (eg let's all agree to give this lecturer a razzle) on online or in class context but does not separate the two modes of evaluation.

Methods: you suggest that such items as emails, bulletin boards and chat rooms are a source of evaluation information. If all on-campus lectures and tutorials were videotaped would not more data be available and these too be legitimate sources? This returns us to our definition and what constitutes evaluation data when students are the sources of information and it is their perceptions of learning we are seeking. I would confine evaluation data to explicit, formally agreed upon sources of information eg expectation questions at the start of semester, or a self-assessment of learning questionnaire at the end of session.

Quantity and type of information: it is true that bulletin boards and the totality of all student interactions are available in electronic transcripts in online classes but the videotaped analogy would introduce even more data in on-campus classes, including non-verbal communication, so the question is whether this is evaluation data or the traditional language of learning and teaching. If one wants to focus on quantity and the type of information, it can be obtained extensively in either learning mode.

Context: using student interactions or student/lecturer interactions for evaluation is no different from tape recording a tutorial and using it for evaluation. In both cases informed consent would be ethically required but it would not be the students' perceptions of learning but an interpretation made by the lecturer.

Methods such as discourse analysis: this point generally applies to those who are researching student learning for research and publication purposes and as with other forms of research, ethical guidelines are clearly applicable here. The point does not differentiate it from on-campus evaluation because you could also analyse verbal and non-verbal interactions in a videotaped tutorial transcript.

So, in the end, I don't think the issue (worms) let loose when you open the can that you mention Gung are any different when student evaluation goes online.

Ima Fencesiter (11/02) Dear Gung and Con.

Your thoughtful postings have really confused me! I find I'm agreeing with both of you on all points.

I found myself reflecting that 'Evaluation is a means not an end to improving teaching'. Whether the 'means' are, either online/offline, evaluation must be based on an ethically sound, valid, objective, supportive collection in order to safeguard potential invalidity due to ethical breaches, e.g. lack of confidentiality or informed consent. Evaluation must be 'fair to all and seen to be fair'.

So with that in mind, I have thought about the pros and cons of each and although I have not fully reached a conclusion, the following are some issues. On the question of return rates of evaluation responses and whether they increase or decrease in relation to on-campus attendance, I have found it is rare for even face-to-face classes to get a 100% attendance, even in the final lecture! It may be in some ways been easier to respond in the electronic medium when time and location aren't major factors - however, the question of motivation to evaluate (in either form) must be a paramount consideration. So attendance is not really an issue.

On the matter of location, I'm not sure that the physical location necessarily generates a better or worse response, nor greater or fewer numbers of responses. Intervening variables such as personal or family illness, other work pressures, disinterest, and computer failure can affect the response rates in both mediums.

Many evaluations only collect data via questionnaires. I would hope that we would use more than this method in order to cross-validate these responses. We should encourage all staff to undertake further analysis; such analysis or verification could include focus group analysis (which can be on bulletin boards or run on campus); peer review (via bulletin board, email or face to face); and input from other stakeholders, e.g. employers (via email, or face-to-face). It would be great to integrate all these methods!

The timing of evaluations, whether at the end-of-year or during semester, should be optional for all staff, whether they evaluate online or face-to-face. Similarly, whether student or student/lecturer interactions are evaluated, it should not matter as both can equally be encompassed in either online or face-to-face methods.

My reflections seem to be introducing more red herring into the argument than coming to conclusions. Maybe this reflects my position. What I am clear about is that many of our teaching team are now moving to fully online teaching. So the question of 'is student evaluation online different from, or similar to, student evaluation in other contexts?' is one we need to address NOW. Part of doing this will be clarifying whether
evaluation consists only of formal evaluations, explicitly agreed upon with students, or whether teaching-learning interactions can also be defined as evaluation. Maybe we can combine our ideas into a paper and present it to the next Faculty meeting?!

Coda

And so we did. You have now read our paper. What would be your response if you joined the conversation at this point? Do you agree with Gung, Con or Ima? What issues did they miss?

Interested in continuing the conversation?

If you are interested in further discussion of the ethical issues associated with online student evaluation of teaching, you are invited to join a facilitated conversation amongst HERDSA members, and others with an interest in the area, in the fortnight commencing Tuesday 11th June 2002. This online discussion is the first segment in a three stage process for a paper which has been accepted for presentation at the HERDSA 2002 Conference in July; the second will be a sixty-minute workshop at the conference and the third will be post-conference online discussion.

To join the online discussion commencing Tuesday 11th June 2002:

Send an email message to: LISTSERV@latrobe.edu.au
In the body of the message type in: SUBSCRIBE ADSIG Your Name
Do not insert anything else in the email.

Upon successfully completing this subscription step, you will receive an email message outlining the LISTSERV protocols and procedures. You may also leave the list at any time by sending a "SIGNOFF ADSIG" command to LISTSERV@LUGB.LATROBE.EDU.AU.

These conversations will provide an opportunity for individuals to reflect on their personal evaluation practices and on practices within their institution. They may also be of value in raising awareness of the ethical issues with respect to student evaluation of teaching across a variety of teaching and learning environments against the current backdrop of contemporary quality agendas.

References


Hmielaski, K. H. (2000). Barriers to online evaluation. Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute Interactive and Distance Education Assessment (IDEA) Laboratory. Retrieved from the World Wide Web:
http://idea/psych.rpi.edu/evaluation/report.htm [2002 18th January].


http://www.tss.uoguelph.ca/stthe/ethics.html [2002 3rd January].


http://ts.mivu.org/default.asp?show=article&id=823 [2002 18th January].

Coralie McCormack: Lecturer; Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship, University of Canberra.

Contact: cem@cts.canberra.edu.au

Andrelyn Applebee: (Acting) Assoc. Professor Information Management & Project Manager for Flexible Delivery Program; Division of Communication and Education, University of Canberra.

Peter Donnan: Instructional Designer; Flexible Delivery Development Unit; Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship, University of Canberra.
Reflections after September 11: Focusing on the student experience

by Christine Asmar

As September 2001 approached, I was preparing to visit several universities in the United States to present research I had done in 1999-2000 on the course experience of Muslim students in western universities. In the wake of the catastrophe, I offered to cancel the October visit, expecting that sensitivities were still raw. All three universities where I was scheduled to speak, however, insisted on going ahead with the seminars. As one institution put it: 'The university community is seeking ways to have a dialogue that leads to better understanding'. The ongoing commitment of the US tertiary sector to continue interacting with the kind of difference seen as 'exotic or even inimical' (Rizvi and Walsh, 1998, 9) can be overlooked amid media reports of unfortunate incidents. In some passing reflections on those seminars I will suggest that much can be learnt from our own students in how we define, perceive and engage with difference in our interconnected world. I will also touch on the role of research and scholarship in how we might deal with those differences.

The American universities' emphasis on dialogue necessitated bringing Muslim and non-Muslim students, academics and general staff together. Although students were not numerous at the seminars, their presence mattered. I began by asking participants what they thought people in the wider community assumed about Muslim levels of education. Were Muslims living in the west likely to be attending university in proportions equal to, greater than, or less than the proportion in the population as a whole? Responses were mixed, but a sizeable group usually went for 'less'. According to my analysis of 1996 Australian census data, however, a higher percentage of Muslims attends university than the percentage in the population generally (Asmar, 2000, 142). This surprised some participants. What surprised them even more was that the same situation applies to Muslim women. When we in Australia encounter Muslims among us, including women, they are quite likely to be highly educated.

These findings provoked some debate regarding our own preconceptions, as well as how one might interpret such data. It was proposed that international students might be influencing the Australian figures. While this is almost certainly true, it makes little difference to how Muslims are treated by the western societies in which they live. An Australian-born female student who had recently adopted the hijab (headscarf) reported in interviews: 'I never experienced racism before I put this on and now you have people saying, "Hey you, go back home"."

Other research findings provoked a similar debate. Surveying 13 Australian campuses, I had found that Muslim women (most of whom, in my sample, wore the hijab) were significantly less likely than Muslim men to feel comfortable interacting with non-Muslim students in their courses. Generally speaking, the men were more relaxed in interactions with non-Muslims, while regularly encountering expectations that they were likely to oppress women, and to have terrorist inclinations (this was before 2001). Observant Muslim women who cover are more readily identifiable than their male peers. The question then was, are the women themselves reluctant to engage with their non-Muslim peers, or are they somehow being made to feel uncomfortable? And what is the role of their teachers in this respect? In the Australian survey, a majority of students felt their teachers treated them the same as other students, with some exceptions: 'I had to prove myself to them as being as good or even better than the majority before they could look at me properly', said one. Some American Muslims were forthright: 'Because I am obvious, if the teacher says something disparaging about Islam in class, the whole class would swing around to look at me'. Another was told by her teacher in class: 'If you wear a hijab you're oppressed, I can't believe you don't know you're oppressed. You're just brainwashed.' She felt this had affected the way fellow-students treated her: 'Friends who already knew me agreed with him. There's such a power imbalance in there.' In the seminars this led to a wider discussion of spotlighting and stereotyping. Muslims present contributed accounts of their personal experiences, agreeing that observant women, as a visibly different minority, were more often singled out. Not surprisingly, females in the Australian survey were less likely than males to feel that Muslim students were valued by their institutions.

On the positive side we noted that most Muslim students surveyed were very satisfied with, and strongly committed to, the academic aspects of their courses. In Australia, overall levels of satisfaction with their institutions were on a par with what the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) tells us about Australian students in general. Also, in both countries, experiences of outright discrimination occurred off campus more often than within the relatively secure university environment.

Despite the possibility of tensions, there was no conflict between seminar participants. The students were excited that issues salient to them now had a public forum. Given that opportunities for student-student interactions on non-course-related issues are relatively rare in our busy lives, we were all reminded of the benefits of such interactions. Students' voices were highlighted both in the research findings, and in the discussion of those findings. I later received messages from academics, students and general staff commenting on the benefits of the informal discussion as well as the formal presentation. Participants were encouraged to ask the Muslims questions, so that much of the talking went on across and around the room rather than through the presenter. One Provost commented that opening the session up to the whole university community had made an important point: 'Our Muslim students know we care about them and that really makes a difference'. One professor wrote to me that 'the lasting impact of your research and insights became obvious a week later, when I stumbled upon a discussion of your topic among Arts and Sciences academics and graduate students'.

Before concluding these reflections, the issue of how we generally deal with religion requires discussion. Historically, secular western universities have taken little account of students' religious affiliation. In Australia policies, practices and programs tend to focus on such
aspects as language background, Aboriginality, and international student status. Australia’s publicly funded universities are barred from ascertaining the religious affiliation of students. However, an ever-increasing intake of international students, many from Muslim countries (Asmar, 2000, 145), has affected institutional priorities and, to a lesser extent, teaching practices. How Muslim students are treated by Australian universities, for example in terms of institutions’ willingness to spend money on prayer facilities, appears related to pragmatic considerations such as the fact that in 2000, international students generated $3.7 billion for the Australian economy and contributed $2 billion to university coffers (Campus Review Jan 30-Feb 5, 2002). This constitutes a significant incentive to ensure such students continue to be attracted here and that they remain satisfied with their course experiences. In an interesting twist of events following September 11, reports that the US government was to restrict visas for foreign students for security reasons have led to hopeful speculation that: ‘The move could aid Australian institutions seeking to increase their share of the international market’ (The Australian, 31 October 2001). Some years ago Rhoades and Smart (1996) argued forcefully that international students are treated as a commodity in Australia, but are subjected to xenophobic treatment in the United States. In the era of global interconnectedness it would be unfortunate if both these assertions continued to be true.

In the USA difference has often been categorised in terms of race. As in Australia, religious differences have received far less attention, although more is now being published on this subject (Nash, 2001; Laird, 2000; Speck, 1997). Secular institutions may have something to learn from universities with Christian affiliations, where observant Muslim students (perhaps unexpectedly) report that they feel very comfortable. Commented a male student at an Australian Catholic university: Being religious, as Catholics, they understand our needs... Our relationship has been pretty good from the very beginning because the university likes to encourage multi-religion relations. It’s been interesting to see the two faiths interacting.

Inter-faith forums are useful but do not negate the need for interactions in classrooms and seminars. Immediately after September 11, most US universities moved to cut off the possibility of conflict on campus, and to promote democratic principles of free speech, acceptance and understanding. Australian universities took similar actions, albeit with less urgency. In both countries, dialogue and debate were sponsored, while support was offered to affected students in various ways. Teaching staff were included in some initiatives. The University of Michigan, long committed to scholarly teaching approaches, issued post-September 11 guidelines for instructors in which they urged them to ‘integrate the intellectual frameworks of their disciplines into discussions of surrounding issues’.

(http://www.crilt.mich.edu)

If teaching is defined as including the fostering of institutional values then what I am suggesting connects to the scholarship of university teaching which is the focus of this issue. Both research and scholarship can support a commitment within teaching institutions to the valuing of difference. The need for scholarly approaches is heightened in a climate where opinion and polemic are rife. We need, perhaps, to recall that Muslims in our societies have been experiencing negative stereotyping for several decades prior to 2001. While I have not surveyed students post-September 11, media and other reports indicate that their situation has been tense. Scholars and researchers in the field of higher education have long sought to promote increased student interactions as a means of enhancing learning. Now, it seems, there may be increased barriers to such interactions – and more skill needed to facilitate them. How academics are perceived as responding to their students can also influence student-student relations. The students themselves have plenty of ideas on what they find helpful. A female respondent in the USA, generally positive about her university, reported:

In my Chemistry class the Eid [Muslim feast] fell on a lab day. I went to my professor and said I would have to miss lab, and he said ‘Oh, I was careful to avoid putting the exam on the day of the Eid’, and I could make up the lab, there was no problem. The Muslim dates are in the University Planner this year for the first time.

What I have tried to suggest here is that scholarly approaches can inform how we approach our students, and how we interact with difference on our campuses, even - or especially - in a time of crisis. These are not issues which can be handed over to student support services and/or addressed in one or two public debates and then forgotten. Research can be a powerful resource in equipping us to deal with the issue of religious and other differences. We may also need to re-think how we define difference, as the case of international students demonstrates. Even more important is the question of how we model, in front of all our students, the ways in which such differences can be valued rather than ignored or targeted. By foregrounding students’ own experiences and perceptions, both in the seminars and in this paper, I am arguing for the student-centred approach long advocated by our educational researchers. Focusing on the situation of Muslim students does not constitute a plea for special treatment, but rather an argument for equitable approaches in terms of making students feel valued. Teaching how to engage and connect with difference is simply part of educating all our students to be global citizens in a sometimes difficult world.
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Tutors' perceptions of dysfunctional behaviour in problem-based learning tutorial groups

Graham D. Hendry

Introduction

Since the introduction of problem-based learning (PBL) in the mid 1960's, many versions have been developed worldwide and just what passes for PBL these days is often quite diverse (Myers Kelson & Distlehorne, 2000). However, the essence of small-group PBL remains the fact that students work collaboratively on understanding a problem. The roles of both the tutor and students in promoting and maintaining collaboration are critical. As Faidley et al. (2000) argue, "collaborative learning does not result from simply meeting in a group" (p. 132). A tutor's role includes creating a supportive group climate, encouraging the involvement of all students and addressing group problems when they arise.

In this article the results of a qualitative study of group problems encountered by experienced tutors in Years 1 and 2 of the problem-based University of Sydney Medical Program (USydMP) are reported. An aim of this study is to provide a basis for further research on tutors' and students' perceptions of problems, and guide the development of a training and support program for tutors. As Hitchcock and Anderson (1997) point out, some PBL tutors "have found themselves in small groups that actually harm individuals and the learning climate. When such situations occur, they are particularly difficult for students and teachers. Faculty must be trained to deal with dysfunctional groups if we are to avoid these outcomes" (p. 19).

Hitchcock and Anderson (1997) investigated the effectiveness of certain strategies to deal with dysfunctional groups. They rotated 23 experienced tutors through five training stations or 'dysfunctional scenarios' and observed the effectiveness of tutors' interventions. The scenarios, based on "the five most typical (difficult) situations" that the authors had observed at the John A. Burns School of Medicine in Hawaii (in their capacity as faculty developers), were classified as (1) group apathy (eg, no use of whiteboard, no discussion), caused by cynicism about PBL and/or beliefs that people learn best on their own, (2) exclusive group focus on biological issues and avoidance of discussion of psychosocial issues, (3) student absenteeism, or a student not "pulling his/her weight", (4) an overly quiet or "scapegoated" (ie, ignored) student, and (5) a dominant student who prematurely divulges diagnoses, brought on by frustration with what he/she perceives as the slowness of PBL.

To identify group problems in a 'hybrid' PBL-lecture medical program in Ontario, Canada, Houlden et al. (2001) interviewed 27 tutors. Analysis of transcripts revealed six common problems, classified as (1) "mini lecturing", ie, didactic presentations with little discussion, (2) "family feuds" involving passive, dominant, independent students, absentees or "coasters", (3) "speedy Gonzales", ie, a group rushing through tutorials to get the 'right answer' or finish early, (4) "just scratching the surface", or superficial study of a case, (5) "feed me", or frustration with non-content-expert tutors, and (6) "doubting Thomases" or students who perceive PBL as too time consuming and/or prefer didactic instruction.

Both Hitchcock and Anderson (1997) and Houlden et al. (2001) identify categories of individual and group dysfunctional behaviour. It appears that some group problems could be generic (eg, 'passive' or dominant students) while others may be context-specific (eg, exclusive group focus on biological issues), perhaps as a result of certain curricular or tutorial designs.

Curriculum design of the University of Sydney Medical Program

The curriculum in Years 1 and 2 of the graduate-entry University of Sydney medical program is structured around a pattern of three weekly PBL tutorials. Students work together in groups of 8-9 with a Faculty tutor in 90-minute sessions and follow a well-defined tutorial process, illustrated in Figure 1. Groups are made up of students from a variety of degree backgrounds (eg, nursing, medical science, psychology) and are gender balanced.

Method

Individual interviews were held with eight experienced tutors, including three basic science tutors, three non basic science tutors (education, psychology, public health) and two medically trained tutors (one of whom was in clinical practice). Experienced tutors were defined as staff who had taught in three or more blocks within or across Years 1 and 2.

Interviews began with the following request, "Tell me about any time in your tutoring when you have encountered a difficult situation, either with a student or the group as a whole". Notes taken in the interviews were read through repeatedly to identify common themes and issues. Category definitions were developed and checked by a colleague not connected with the study (three changes were made as a result).

Results

Seven categories of individual and two categories of group dysfunctional behaviour were developed from the interview data as follows (numbers in brackets indicate the number of tutors who mentioned this issue):

Individual dysfunctional behaviour

- Quiet student - very quiet, rarely contributes to discussion, shy (7)
  "(a) difficulty is someone who is really really quiet and almost does not say a word ... This creates tension in the group when someone is dead quiet."
- Dominant student - talks a lot, tries to control the direction of discussion, prevents others from contributing (6)
“One student took over the whole group process... He had quite a bit of knowledge which he forced on the group. He directed all hypothesis generation and explained all the mechanisms without letting the others contribute. He was constantly promoting himself.”

- Bullying - teasing or ‘picking on’ others, making others the subject of jokes (4)

“Started out as a fun situation then got a bit out of hand... (a male student) started to use (a female) as the topic of all jokes, eg, little jokes about X, little comments, as things progressed she was getting a bit fed up.”

- Lack of commitment - not making an effort to participate properly, giving the impression that PBL is not useful (3)

“One fellow was a thorn in the side of others, he was always late and very flippant toward the whole PBL process. He made it clear that he thought the whole thing was a waste of time.”

- Lateness, absenteeism - arriving late or not turning up for tutorials (2)

“There was constant lateness on the part of a few people.”

- Personality clash - not relating well to another student (2)

“there were two students who didn’t get on, they didn’t see eye to eye. This effected the climate of the group, it was tense, not a relaxed climate. They had different personalities.”

- Psychosocial - disparages psychosocial aspects of a case (1)

“Another student in the same group declared himself as a stereotypical Orthopaedic surgeon, and kept putting down the psychosocial aspects of the cases.”

Group dysfunctional behaviour

- Disorganised tutorial (group and/or clinical reasoning) process (2)

“The group process was very haphazard.”

- Shortcutting the tutorial process (Year 2 only) (1)

“One group was short cutting the process. It was more likely that they would roll tutorials 2 and 3 together.”

Discussion

Interviews with eight experienced tutors revealed that there is both individual and group dysfunctional behaviour in the USydMP. The most common group problems identified are individual quietness and dominant behaviour. These problems have also been reported at other medical schools that use PBL (Hitchcock & Anderson, 1997; Houlden et al., 2001). Cynicism or apathy about PBL is shown by individual students in the USydMP, and has been displayed by groups (Hitchcock & Anderson, 1997) and individuals (Houlden et al., 2001) (ie, ‘doubling Thomases’) elsewhere. Absenteeism or lateness is also described, and may occur partly as a result of cynicism about PBL. However, while bullying or teasing is a problem in the USydMP, it is not reported in the literature at other institutions.

It also appears that some group problems may be context—or curricular-specific. Avoidance of psychosocial issues (Hitchcock & Anderson, 1997), mini lecturing, rushing through tutorials, superficial study of a case, and frustration with non-content-expert tutors (Houlden et al., 2001) do not seem to occur as frequently in the USydMP. This may be due to controlling effects in the Sydney course of the structured PBL tutorials (see Figure 1) and high level of support provided to tutors, in the form of comprehensive tutor guides and weekly preview meetings.

De Grave et al. (2001) investigated students’ perceptions of common group problems or ‘critical incidents’ in a problem-based medical course. The authors surveyed a stratified random sample of 200 students across years 1 to 4 to identify the frequency with which group problems occur. The survey, developed from focus group data, was comprised of items that formed six factors or broad categories of ‘critical incidents’. The most frequent problems perceived by students involved unequal participation (eg, ‘the parasite’ student), lack of interaction (eg, ‘reading aloud’) and lack of elaboration (eg, ‘skipping remaining learning issues’). At first glance, it does not seem that students in this course identified problems similar to those perceived by tutors at USydMP and other institutions. However, for two factors, ‘lack of participation’ and ‘difficult personalities’, students rated the situations “one student does not say much” and “a dominant student in the tutorial group” as occurring most frequently.

The aims of further research on group problems in the USydMP will be to measure the frequency of various dysfunctional behaviours as perceived by tutors, and gain a representative indication of how comfortable and how well prepared tutors feel in dealing with group problems. It may also be worthwhile to survey students in Years 1 and 2 using the same questionnaire items, and compare tutors’ and students’ perceptions.

The key questions that still remain are, “What are the possible causes of dysfunctional behaviour?” and “What are effective strategies (interventions) that a tutor could use to help students?”. As Mann (1964) argues, “there is always a reason for people behaving as they do... the reasons for the way an individual acts may not be clear to the group, or even to himself, but the reasons are there nevertheless” (p. 354).

In the present study, several tutors reported speaking privately to a quiet student in their group and discovering underlying reasons for the person’s quietness or shyness. In one case, a student was working every week night then catching up on his/her reading at weekends, and did not feel that he/she knew enough to contribute, in another case, a student was contemplating leaving the Medical Program. Tiberius (1999) claims that “there is no single ‘type’ of silent student. Students may be silent for a number of reasons” (p. 122). For example, “some (students) have quiet personalities. They do not regard themselves as silent, they do not feel shut out of the conversation, and they are actively participating while speaking only rarely or using very few words when they do speak” (p. 122). Tutors (and the group) should accept and cooperate with these students. Other students may be overly quiet because of “feelings of inferiority, or other (issues that) they would like to overcome” (p. 122).

For Mann (1964), dysfunctional behaviour in groups is caused by group members striving to satisfy unfulfilled needs. The main needs are “the need to establish and maintain self-respect; the need to ‘belong’ to the group; the need to establish or maintain a role; and the need for recognition or affection” (p. 355). Groups work well when group members understand each others’ needs and whenever possible meet these requirements (Mann, 1964).

Tiberius (1999) has developed a range of strategies for dealing with dysfunctional behaviour in small groups, although recommended practices are not
always linked directly to a specific cause. Table 1 lists possible causes of quietness and dominant behaviour, and useful strategies for dealing with these behaviours identified by Tiberius and other authors.

**Conclusion**

This study shows that dysfunctional behaviour can occur in PBL groups in the USydMP, and suggests that the most common type of individual problems are quietness and dominance. Problems can have a variety of causes, and tutors must be flexible in how they deal with individual students. Clearly, there is a need for further research on dysfunctional behaviour in PBL that clarifies causal mechanisms, and specifies and evaluates the most effective strategies for helping students to form and maintain effective groups.
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Table 1.
Causes of quietness and dominant behaviour, and strategies for dealing with these problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quietness</th>
<th>Causes(s)</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfulfilled need to establish or maintain a role, &quot;to be a follower&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Scared to talk before a group&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about norms for participation in tutorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of inferiority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest in speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dominance</th>
<th>Causes(s)</th>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unfulfilled need for self-respect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfulfilled need to establish or maintain a role, &quot;to be boss&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self centredness, seeking satisfaction of a personal need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Outgoing person by nature, (2) believes &quot;that people have not heard of fully appreciated the point, and/or (3) feels the need to compete with other assertive speakers&quot; (p. 118)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Mann (1964)
Jaques (1991)
Tiberius (1999)
Mann (1964)
Jaques (1991)
Tiberius (1999)
Jaques (1991)
Tiberius (1999)

A ‘Pro’ by any other name?  
Anatomy of a Cyber-Discussion

"Its peculiar or essential function ... which, were it not to exist, no other institution could discharge ... ought to be that universities are places where conceptions of and standards of rational justification are elaborated, put to work in the detailed practices of inquiry, and themselves rationally evaluated, so that only from the university can the wider society learn how to conduct its own debates, practical or theoretical, in a rationally defensible way" [Alasdair Maclntyre, 1990. Three Rival Versions of Moral Inquiry, London: Duckworth, p.222]

A Morally-Charged Landscape

The first draft of this article posted on the ADSIG-List for discussion generated some interesting outcomes. In Australia there has been ongoing public discourse about the moral standing of Higher Education, its institutions and functionaries. The “marks for money” scandal in one smaller university is still being played out. In another VERY LARGE ONE charges of "nepotism, cronyism and maladministration" are making headlines. Hence to reflect on the nature of institutional corruption seemed a reasonably apt fit with the temper of the times.

How to approach it? A national newspaper article offered a lead. From the “children overboard” and “Pacific Solution” scandals besieguing Australia’s third-term conservative government a metaphor-with-attitude emerged. One journalist saw Australia’s ridicing itself of the illegal “boat people” problem (in which Pacific island states were invited to accept refugees in exchange for very large sums of foreign aid) as inciting those nations to "prostitute" themselves.

Now there’s a metaphor with moral punch. Remove it from the sexual milieu and “to prostitute oneself” remains a scathing descriptor of corrupt action. “To cause another to prostitute themselves” speaks of an even more dissolute moral status (images of parents selling children into slavery!). Follow the trail ...

Developing

Conversation with a friend: “I’m tempted to do a piece on intellectual prostitution that’ll start something like this: ‘I’ve only paid for sex a couple of times in my life but I’ve neither guilt nor regrets about either’”. Naughty? Yes, but also terribly serious. An impertinent, irrelevant, uncalled-for personal admission, demanding attention, establishing unambiguously a moral stance, that: (i) this is not to be an anti-prostitution tract, and (ii) the prostitution metaphor is worth “mining” for whatever it can give (how far can metaphors multiply?)

The particular moral corruption invoked by the ‘prostitution’ metaphor will be presented as real, but not as the result of an inherently wrong action. Selling sex is legal and, to this author, in itself ethical. The metaphor’s richness lies in its invoking, latently perhaps, a complex network – a whole world - of moral agents and agencies, all waiting to be corrupted. There are pimps, protectors, managers, prostitutes themselves, and their clients. All inhabit a larger social context of deprivation and inequity which often requires people to live by prostitution. Can one - dare one - thus describe academia today?

Without high risk great gain is unlikely. Remember Anthony Jay’s advice (scriptwriter for Fawlty Towers, wrote a brilliant booklet on public speaking). You take an audience right to the edge of the precipice, and teeter there with them, terrified of where you have both wandered to. If you’re not prepared for that risk, you’re a very ordinary speaker – competent, perhaps, but mundane - and forgettable.

Checking

Mirth was evoked when the metaphor was run past some Developers at a party. A couple of unprintably bad cases of academic ‘prostitution’ were mentioned, one of them the “review” of a Unit. Then it was run past a staunch feminist (Catholic, a retired academic) who responded “Go with it! It cuts the ice.” But what about the ‘very personal bit'? “Don’t forget” she said, “the personal is STILL the political”.

Won’t this be an ‘argument by analogy’? I think not. We’re not saying “here’s what I think” and using the metaphor to prove it. Metaphor illuminates the truth in its own way. You follow, see where it leads, and learn. People respond as the metaphor touches, and maybe tests, their moral sensibilities. That’s how moral discourse works (yes, I know it’s out of fashion but I’m an old-fashioned intellectual).

The working title was “A-whoring we will go? Indecent observations on the state of scholarship”. That replaced an earlier one (too risque?) “Tart for Dessert? Thoughts about science as an industry of the night”.

If you’re not on ADSIG-List and want to read the original, e-mail editor Roger. He has permission to distribute it freely. Why not print it in full, here? Frankly, I found that it failed to achieve the purpose I had intended.

That’s not a serious crime – it happens to teachers all the time. But in this case the “collateral damage” was more than I’d bargained for.

I think that damage arose from an unwanted and awkward convergence of (a) the metaphor’s shock-power and (b) most of the vocal audience’s tendency to run for cover (“Not me!”). Also to make extraordinarily unjustified and untested assumptions ... (such as that) the piece was personally self-indulgent [tut tut], arguing-by-analogy [ouch!], simply out to shock people [never], gender-biased [which gender?], offensive to prostitutes [my fond friends], ‘academic’ ethics are quite independent of institutional ethics [oh my!], and so on ...

So, just as I would if teaching two parallel seminar groups, when I find that things go less favourably than I wanted with Group 1, I’ll change the plan for Group 2. Hence the following retrospective on the outcomes of what I
still regard as a somewhat ill-fated discussion trigger.

Some will argue (they already have) that the prostitution metaphor triggered the best (the ONLY!) “good discussion” the ADSIG-List has had for half a year! That may be so, but I, as “teacher”, found it seriously — and depressingly — wanting. And I share the blame there. It may even be cowardly of me not to publish the original here, but that’s a criticism I’m willing to accept.

Still, if enough readers disagree with me on that point, we can maybe have yet another “good discussion”. I’m game. One of the legitimate roles of the discussion leader, in my book on teaching, is to be an annoyance — the gadfly theory of teaching. And there’s no need to remind me of what happened to its most famous proponent.

**Synopsis - Discussion Trigger**

**INTRODUCTION**

- Personal admission (attention-getter); moral principle established (prostitution’s basically okay)
- Intention stated: “prostitution as moral metaphor” — let’s explore it
- Author’s caveat: Little authority to speak on prostitution per se but possibly some on academic life, which is the article’s target — can the metaphor be applied?
- Example of metaphor’s use: Australian refugee politics — “paying others to prostitute themselves” but how apt for us? (implied challenge to take the metaphor beyond the prostitute and see a bigger picture)

**MORAL ANALYSIS**

- Clearing the deck: demolish two popular moral myths about prostitution, hence probe below the prejudiced surface; where does the moral problem (if there is one) really lie?
- Unpacking the ‘corruption’ deal; Com pivility but how?
- Lowering of standards “pay me enough and I’ll do anything you want”
- Openness to deceit, illusion and error “mistrusting sex for love”

**APPLICATION:**

- Illustrate each in principle from the “sex industry”, then from the “knowledge industry”.
- Hypothetical instances of corruption from university life

- Academic Development Unit ‘reviews’
- General academic research and teaching (Fanny business? Shady transactions?)

**REMEDIES**

- Moral hazards encountered in any occupation need to be understood and talked about (hence this discussion)
- Ways for individuals and institutions to guard against possible corruptions need constantly working upon — what would we suggest?
- Does “The academic as prophet” become “The academic as prostitute”? [but an implied challenge — who is paying? Only the client? What about the brothel manager?]

**AFTER THE EVENT**

Here we change mode. Below are selected but representative responses what some called a ‘tacky’ discussion-stimulus. Contributors F1 to F6 are female, M1 to M5 male. Most of this virtual group already know one another. They are recognisable because they “sign” their contributions (no anonymity). It was all un-facilitated (a leaderless group) and un-moderated (no censoring of content). EIDOS remained aloof.

### Day 1

**4/03 F1** “I just don’t go for visiting a prostitute metaphor as a framing device”

**4/03 M1** “I dislike ... choosing ... some far-fetched metaphor and building a whole case on that analogy”; “a bit lost”; “what is EIDOS’ real point”? “Is it that the sale of knowledge is morally wrong?” “I have never known pressure brought to bear to bring in a particular judgement” “EIDOS’ informants (must) deal with dodgier people than we have to deal with”

### Day 2

**5/03 F2** “It’s a Catch-22 ... if we dismiss this piece or disapprove of us, we run the risk of being accused of a ‘unwillingness to tackle the unpalatable’ - something like a dilemma”; “... the intention to shock ... is evident”; “obvious sense of metaphor clouds the issues” “the author’s “self” intrudes to such an extent that criticality is lost isn’t that what scholarship is all about?”

**5/03 M2** “challenge, provocation ... strong ethical stand”; “(the case) demands a very close and careful scrutiny”; “the prostitution factor in the knowledge ‘industry’ is a direct experience of mine”, “generated an emotional response in me ... ensuring that it has my attention... not allowing me to feel comfortable and distant from the issues”; “needs to be dealt with deeply ... without the angry reactions of identification and prejudice”

### Day 3

**6/03 F5** “I really dislike (the piece) ... it seems to be all over the place in structure and argument”; “I also think that such organisations as the prostitutes collective ... would have plenty to disagree with & be insulted by in his (stev's) view of prostitution, upon which most of the rest of the article hangs”. Could be interpreted as an attack on those who try to improve the personal and financial safety of prostitutes” “There is a role for an academic to be a critic and conscience of society”, “however the article ... is missing every mark by scattering the bullets all over the place!”

**6/03 M3** “The ‘personally speaking’ bit is self-indulgent ... a distraction from the rest of the message”; “metaphor ... (is) untidy, and itself an act of prostitution”; “it didn’t work for me” “This has not been my experience of academia”. “I believe in love ... and for me love defies market pricing and remains sacred” “Adios EIDOS!”
7/03M2 “A brazen venture”; “... the metaphor, although apparently difficult ... to work with, has not entirely obscured the point”; “out of left-field”; “How many other ‘silent partners’ (unpublished academics) do we have out there who have things to say but cannot, or will not, ... within the established protocols? Who feel they cannot break through the established ‘cliques’?”, “is what is being said ... that personal relationship can often be lacking in the sanitised world of intellectual exploration?”; “there is value in going beyond the metaphor per se and exploring the meaning in the reactions and responses”.  

7/03M4 “at least there is life again on this List!”, “deserves a close reading”; “cognitive dissonance ... how to jolt students out of their comfort zones”; “have we ‘prostituted’ ourselves to the dominant discourse of scaffolding, delivery, and the customer/student is always right?”; “we work in a ruined institution, relentlessly transforming itself from an ideological arm of the state into a consumer-oriented, bureaucratic corporation”; “none of us are untainted by the long, slimy tendrils of the market monster”; “there is this ‘quiet, unassuming transition of scholar from prophet into prostitute’ ... but, on a deeper level, I think Goethe’s story of Faust is closer to the mark”.

Day 5

8/03M5 “(In local Council work) one participates on a Committee with a sense of being ‘paid’ for an ethically compromized service ... such payment comes at a price ... that one cannot be truly bold”, “I take heart ... that (EIDOS) doesn’t think such ‘prostitution’ is intrinsically evil ... But it is ethically risky”; “I’ve most enjoyed in EIDOS’s sometimes extravagant opinions ... that they have regularly ignored or avoided ... scholarly pretensions ... quite often pointedly personal ... what I thought a newsletter was all about”.

Day 9

12/03 F2 “I can connect with EIDOS’ metaphor (but) my problem was with the expression ... it seems pointless ... to write something that’s going to turn off half the population that reads it”, “… I can wear the use of the prostitution metaphor if it really suggests an ethical dilemma ... my problem was associated with the addition of the notion of ‘pleasure’ in an act of commodification (male or female). Its inclusion turned the metaphor on its head ... it turned me off”; “For me the antithesis of commodification ... is personal engagement with something I care deeply about”; “… I do associate scholarly with ‘well written’, as in reasoned or argued, whether it be personal, passionate or challenging”.

Day 12

15/03 M5 “[Does the ADSIG List have] ... more than a handful of people who give a damn about issues of ethics or scholarship or intellect ... ?””, “...everyone except two (contributors) ... has worked overtime at avoiding the issues EIDOS raised”; “… not a single instance of poor argument has been given”; “Illustrate the faults and let us all be the judge”; “If we can’t debate in scholarly fashion (evidence and clear argument) about the supposed un-scholarliness of a colleague’s work, what does that say about our ‘scholarship?’”, “English isn’t a gendered language ... when you mention ‘prostitute’ I think of a man ... and prostitution includes men selling sexual favours for needy women ... and some women sell sexual favours to other women”.

Day 15

18/03 M5 “… impeccably polite style used by Academic Development colleagues ... ‘Don’t say anything that would conceivably offend’”, “(do) discussions, forums and debates amongst friends and co-workers ... need to be ... subject to the normal written communication protocols?”; “(Do they not comprise) ... ordinary speech captured electronically, and not (not necessarily) written idioms”; “the spontaneity, passion, thrust and over-the-topness of truly engaged conversation can (thus) be captured ... (and this is) the risk that makes ordinary conversation ... the wonderful medium that it is”.

Interesting issues emerge, arguably more about the process than the product. Looking back at this un-facilitated and un-moderated cyber-discussion on a peer e-mail “List”, I’d want to now ask:

1. If a group is one already known to one another, is there an argument for contributor anonymity lest the press to politeness (as one contributor mentioned) obstruct the play of passion and spontaneity. And, if that press is ignored, possibly place some friendships in jeopardy?

2. Who moderates the intellectual standards of the debate? It seems presumptuous (even pretentious?) for one amongst colleagues to say “that argument of yours is just not on”. Even daring to call the contributors back to the ostensible “issue” is hazardous. Who determines the “issue” anyhow?

3. Long wordy contributions sometimes address multiple issues. It can be hard to respond to only one issue out of a larger cluster, especially if they are interrelated. Might there need to be a protocol of “one point per communication” – or even a limit on length of contribution (eg one screen-full)?

4. Whom does the group comprise? Is it everyone on the List? Only those who read their mail? Or merely everyone who contributes? Maybe the way a contributor mentally pictures the group and its composition may be significant in determining how they phrase their contribution, or which issues they choose to address.

Ought there to be some discussion protocols such as “address the issues, the argument, the abstract proposition, and not the other person”. Or “always quote the words from the original article or another’s e-mail to which you are responding”. Or would that blunt the cutting edge?

6. Can a ‘group consciousness’ emerge in a fragmented, faceless milieu like this group? I suspect the answer is ‘never’, or ‘only after a long time’. Perhaps we should lower our expectations about what such discussions can ever achieve, beyond a mere airing of opinions? And if that’s all you can get, why bother to do it?

7. In cyber-discussion words are written first and speech becomes visible before it is sent and ‘heard’. Can everyone reasonably be expected to examine, polish, censor
and self-moderate their spontaneous words before pressing the "send" button? What can be done if (on occasions) they don’t?

8. Provided it’s not obscene or malicious, is ‘flaming’ such an evil thing anyhow? If it is to be considered undesirable may we then ask who, on an un-facilitated, unmoderated List, is going to deal with it? Where, then, does the limit lie?

9. Is it better to have a system where uncensored remarks occasionally get through, with possible offence being taken, and the need for retraction and apology, rather than pay the price of tameness and (as one contributor described it) “aridity”?

10. Without invoking devices not presently available on e-mail ‘Lists’, are there simple ways of identifying and distinguishing the “threads” in any discussion? For instance, might contributors use a “thread-identification” system in their message SUBJECT lines? In this discussion, just on the extracts selected for this piece, I counted 17 topic “threads” within 44 distinct conversational “moves”. That’s easy to get out of hand!

POSTSCRIPT

A late contribution:-

Challenge by unidentified correspondent: “This has seemed to me the liveliest debate, with more participants, than any Eidos discussion I have seen before. OK, some of it has little depth, some of it you might not regard highly; is that any different from the academic debates in faculties and boards and conferences that you remember from the days you were on salary?”

Response by cynical and occasionally ‘flaming’ contributor, now suitably contrite: “Yes”, (not regard highly?) “Yes”; (any different from (other) academic debates?) “No, not at all - I remember them only too well”

And the last word (for this piece, anyhow)

Who knows, all said and done, whether the author’s “admission” at the start wasn’t a fiction? Do we need to know anyway? Is there a teacher out there who has never once exaggerated the truth or told a “white lie” as a last resort in order to get a discussion going amongst a silent group? Isn’t the “truth” in a statement sometimes quite different from the literal factuality of its claims?

(The leader of the NSW Upper House recently remarked, in the House, “There is no Standing Order for this House which requires that members tell the truth”. To which one member replied “That may be so, but I intend to do so nevertheless!”)

So, you be the judge. But I doubt whether, in the end, it matters one little bit. What think you, dear reader ... about academic prostitution or about electronic discussion lists?

Eidos

Going to Perth in July for the HERDSA 2002 Conference?

See all the latest information about the Conference on pages 38 and 39.
Book Reviews

Gender and the Restructured University: Changing Management and Culture in Higher Education


Gender and the Restructured University confirms suspicions that the situation for women has not improved but worsened in today's restructured universities where 'competition' and 'hard-nosed' decision-making are rife.

This volume assesses the changes to higher education with attention to issues of gender, patriarchy, knowledge and power. In their introduction to the book, Mackinnon and Brooks suggest that the 'focus on wealth creation' and competition can be seen to threaten 'the fragile commitment to equity goals adopted over the past decade' (p. 2).

The book is heartening in three respects: 1) It highlights the problems realistically and sensibly, without sanguinity about the future. 2) It reminds those of us who have noticed 'women's studies' transmuting into the more mainstream 'cultural studies' that there are still researchers who are not deterred by the fact that the word 'gender' has grown unfashionable. 3) Despite the pessimism that characterises the volume, sober theoretical statements and solid research findings are balanced by warmth, humour and personal reflections on experience.

One example of a chapter that encapsulates analysis and biting humour through metaphor is that by Margaret Allen and Tanya Castleman. They provide a systematic and no-nonsense critique of the 'pipeline' argument - the argument that, because there is a time lag between policy and organisational change, the catch-up for women is coming ... eventually. These authors compellingly demonstrate with appointment and tenure data that the "pipeline" is not uncontrolled. It contains valves and holding bays, deviations and constrictions and it leaks women' (p. 156, italics mine).

Ann Brooks discusses the impact of 'corporatization, commodification and privatization' on the 'body in different senses: the institutional body, bodies of knowledge, and the body as the 'academic self'. Perhaps, we may infer, the new corporate expectations are making women of us all - in that managers, like women in traditional home-making roles, are working long hours and are always to be accessible by corporate (patriarchal) power. Brooks highlights the irony that, while a feminine approach to leadership is seen as valuable, especially in terms of interpersonal skills and collaborative styles, those characteristics - in women - do not seem to translate into appointments to international management positions. She suggests a link between women's management styles and Maori values that may affect Maori participation in management.

It is the constitution of the academic self in the restructured university that Jill Blackmore and Judith Sachs take up in their chapter. They describe in lucid prose the new organisational environment, the changing nature of academic work and the 'academic self', and the meaning of these changes for women in leadership positions broadly defined. They argue that 'flexibility, productivity and performativity, each with its own standardizing and normalizing tendencies, now shape worker identity in the postmodern organisation' (p. 49). Drawing on the results of a three-year study of women in eight universities during the crucial years of 1995-1997, they cite the experiences of women in leadership for whom 'ambivalence' is common, and they outline the different forms of that ambivalence.

Several of the chapters specifically address the activity of management, in particular women's managerial work. Carol Bacchi focuses on the management of equal opportunity, using observations of the changes in rhetoric from affirmative action to mainstreaming, from equal opportunity to diversity - to analyse the significance of the different ways these terms can be interpreted and can accrete meaning for various groups.

For some people, she suggests, 'diversity captures a new sensitivity to differences. For others, it seems to signal a dilution of awareness of inequality' (p. 132). Bacchi calls our attention not only to the relevance of institutional context for these meanings but also to differences in principle that need to be acknowledged and openly discussed.

Robyn Munford and Sylvia Rumball discuss managing innovatively, drawing on their own experiences in managerial positions at Massey University in New Zealand and asserting that 'positive environments within universities can be created' (p. 136). For them the greatest challenge for women in senior management is to encourage collaboration rather than individualism and collegiality rather than competition, and of the writers in the volume, they are perhaps the most optimistic in outlook.

One of the most important functions of this book is to clearly state and analyse the new context for women in universities - one that appears to unravel the efforts to institutionalise change in the 90's. Jan Currie and Bev Thiele evoke the results of a study of the effects of globalization on academic work culture in US and Australian contexts. They describe different kinds of explanations that tend to be offered in relation to whether women and men are treated differently, and they show relationships between the type of response and factors such as gender and discipline. In the end, they suggest that the style of today's corporate universities is decidedly masculine and that the future is likely to bring no improvement over the past for women academics.

Jeff Heam writes of the importance of giving attention to men in academia in any gendered analysis. Particularly interesting is his discussion of contradictions in practice in the context of fundamental change in the values of the university. He highlights the relationships between a) the differing academic and
managerial hierarchies (still male-dominated), b) a more democratic rhetoric but increasingly finer distinctions in a wider array of hierarchies for academics, c) policies that claim to be more equitable alongside practices that perpetuate gendered inequalities, d) generations of academics, with feminists, Marxists, and other outsiders to managerialism finding themselves in managerial positions. He closes with implications for the content of academic disciplines, admitting that 'it is still possible to be a respected male social science academic and not read, support or cite scholarship by women, especially feminist scholarship' (p. 84).

While Eleanor Ramsey acknowledges the market forces that have affected higher education, her chapter 'Managing within the Maelstrom' is particularly appropriate for bringing the book to a close because it describes in the first person, in reflective mode and with insight, her feelings as well as her strategies and their outcomes in relation to a particular management project in the new higher education context. Suggesting the usefulness of her own achievements (with other women whose help she recognises), she discusses the invisibility of good management, instituted without institutional trauma. She is eloquent about the dilemmas, the contradictions, and the complexity of managing as a woman in a difficult environment.

When I first opened this book and began to scan the pages, my impression was, 'There is nothing new here.' However, as I read more carefully, I realised that what is not new is difficulty faced by women in universities. This volume is especially useful for its insights into the context in which women now find themselves and the contradictions and ambivalence that result.

Linda Conrad is Acting Director of the Griffith Institute of Higher Education at Griffith University.

Contact l.conrad@mailbox.gu.edu.au

---

Challenging Knowledge: The University in the knowledge society.


Reviewed by Margaret Buckridge

This book is not an easy read. But I'm no masochist, so you might want to believe me when I say that it is also a very interesting read. For people well versed in the sociology of knowledge, much of its field of reference would be very familiar, but for those of us who are educationists or academics from other areas, the genealogies of thought and the vocabulary saturated with meanings that we don't always suspect make for something of a challenge.

This introduction is not intended to scare readers off; rather, it is to suggest that this scholarly, generously referenced book will be read and utilised in different ways. Delanty's subject is one that we book will be read and utilised in different ways. Delanty's subject is one that we

Some of what Delanty says may be hard for us to hear. He suggests that, contrary to the cherished liberal ideal of the university as a site where new, emancipatory thought is opened up, the university has in fact increasingly been in a fairly tame relationship with the state, and that some of the biggest social movements of the last two centuries - he instances 'the workers' movement, the anti-slavery movement, colonial liberation' - have in fact originated very much outside the university. Even in recent history, although the universities have been assiduous about picking up on the causes of groups that have been treated inequitably (women, people of colour, disabled people), they can hardly be seen as the point of origin for these ideas.

He also suggests that the current basis for the relationship between universities, the state and industry is problematic in that it lacks compelling necessity. Both the state and industry could and would proceed with their agendas - of research, of application, of training, of cultural formation - whether the universities are in there or not. Institutional configuration would necessarily change, of course, but all of this work could be covered without the university.

So how did this state of affairs come about? Delanty suggests perhaps three main factors, themselves interacting. The first he calls 'the democratisation of knowledge'. This refers not only to mass involvement in all levels of education, but also to a changed set of workplace and communication arrangements whereby users frequently play the major role in producing the knowledge they need. At the very least, users, rather than academic or other producers, determine the nature and value of knowledge. The second contributing factor is communication technology. Delanty sees this as producing fundamental changes to 'the epistemic structure of society'. Who knows what, when? Who uses it, why, who gives it value or meaning? Who regulates it? The university, and indeed the state, once had much greater purchase on the answers to these questions. They will never again. The third factor, again interacting with the other two, is globalisation. The nation state was once
central institution at the global level, commanding the loyalties of its subjects and focusing their citizenship through political and social issues contained within their borders. Now, there is not only some slippage between nation and state (Australians have Indonesia as a reference point here), but, more important, the globalisation of economics and politics has brought in its wake a somewhat unexpected re-focusing on smaller, more local affiliations, an embrace of difference. Thus the key dimension of identity and citizenship has shifted from the political and social to the cultural.

These are complex ideas, partly because of the interaction between them. They are also complex because they exist on the basis of a world that is still new to us and only half understood. Such shifts, although perhaps not of this magnitude, have occurred before and have had to be understood. The history of that understanding is relevant and requires respect because it now feeds into how we will construct a conceptualisation that meets these new conditions. Delanty's tracings of the various theoretical traditions and the various debates are clear and systematic. He canvases a wide range of theorists, treating the work with fairness even where he himself would not seem to be particularly persuaded. The book is, however, much more than a summary of these traditions of thought. From quite early on, Delanty gears his analysis to the kind of proposition that he will ultimately make about the role that the university needs to construct for itself.

This proposition when it comes is perhaps easier to give assent to than to visualise. It has a number of aspects. Primarily, he suggests that the university can and should be a site for communication between diverse knowledges, particularly knowledges from 'the opposing domains of technology and culture'. Under the conditions of knowledge production now current, much knowledge is being produced which never tests its commensurability with other relevant knowledge, which is never communicated, perhaps never generalised to the point of transfer, certainly never finalised to the point of becoming knowledge rather than information, etc. An important part of this project requires the development of something that he sees as a new mode of knowledge (beyond the Modes 1 & 2 of Gibbons et al.), a mode of knowledge that is reflexive not just in its relation to self-monitoring, but in its potential to transform the cognitive structures from which it comes. Both of these dynamics then, the bringing together of knowledge and the reflexiveness, would be directed towards the enhancement of the citizenship necessary for our present circumstances, a citizenship that is cosmopolitan in its cultural and technological competence and consciousness. This would be the university's purpose and contribution.

It is possible to have some reservation. It is not altogether clear why this conceptualisation would draw the utilitarian support it would need, for all that it might make for a better world. But perhaps with the odd example of 'the good state' and 'the good corporation', we can begin to see how there might be a way forward. I was also not sure that the cognitive reflexiveness Delanty is calling for is not already a treasured part of the very best Mode 1 knowledge. But perhaps the point is more a matter of getting this reflexiveness into the mainstream.

Ultimately, this is a significant attempt to acknowledge the shortfalls in our globalised, electronic post-modern world and to suggest, without nostalgia, that there is a role for universities, different though it may be from the roles it has played in the past. Although one is left wanting greater concreteness, there is no doubt that Delanty's advocacy makes for compelling reading.
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Latest News

Plans are well advanced for the 2002 HERDSA Conference in Perth Western Australia. This year’s conference is set to be rather special.

The Conference is pleased to confirm three world class keynote speakers:

- Dr David Woodhouse, Executive Director Australian Universities Quality Agency
- Dr Pat O’Shane, Chancellor, University of New England, NSW.
- Dr Tom Reeves, Professor of Instructional Technology, University of Georgia.

Four pre-conference workshops have been arranged for Sunday 7th July. The workshops all relate to issues of quality. Internationally recognised experts in the field will lead the workshops, and participants can expect highly worthwhile interactions. The workshops are:

- Developing the Quality Audit Process: Dr David Woodhouse
- External Peer review of the quality of learning objects: Dr Peter Taylor & Dr Craig Zimitat
- Designing web-based course with authentic activities: Dr Tom Reeves, Dr Jan Herrington & Professor Ron Oliver
- Teaching large classes: What are the issues and what are we doing about them: Associate Professor Denise Chalmers & Dr Janice Orrell

Full details and registration forms are on the conference website

This year the Conference planners gave delegates the opportunity to have a refereed paper published in Research and Development in Higher Education Volume 25, which is the Refereed Conference Publication, or a non refereed paper in the Conference Proceedings. There has been an excellent response to the call for papers. Approximately 280 submissions were received and over 100 were refereed papers. In total there are 430 authors representing over twenty countries and every continent, except Antarctica. The planners are grateful to the HERDSA membership for the tremendous response to the request to act as referees, and for all their hard work.

The HERDSA Annual General Meeting will be conducted during the Conference. All delegates are members and are warmly invited to attend, and encouraged to contribute to decisions about the organisation and its future direction.
A full and dynamic social program has been planned to ensure that delegates enjoy a rich experience with many opportunities to have fun, build friendships, and to extend professional conversations. The formal program features:

- Drinks and nibbles with the sharks at the West Australian Aquarium (come wearing or carrying a conversation piece- any item to stimulate discussion)
- A charity ball All that Glitters is not Gold (come wearing something relevant to the theme purchased from a charity shop)
- Poster event with cheese and wine
- A common interest café crawl (join a group of people with a shared interest for Tuesday evening meal)
- Conference Swan Valley Wine Tour (book with registration)

In addition HERDSA 2002 will introduce a new conference concept: The Conference Fringe. This will involve a variety of activities throughout the conference, for example music and drama performances, art exhibitions, nature trails, sport and relaxation activities. Delegates are asked to make suggestions for things they would like to do, and to organise a group to do it. Performances by gifted and talented delegates are especially invited.

The Conference is located on the Joondalup campus of Edith Cowan University. Joondalup is a 30 minute drive north of Perth City centre (45k). It has good road, rail and bus networks, and delegates staying in the recommended accommodation have the option of using the conference bus service. The winter weather in Perth, is usually bright and sunny by day (17c) and cool at night (9c). However, it can also rain heavily, so please bring an umbrella (there will be some walking across the campus).

Full details and registration information is available on the Conference Website: http://www.ecu.edu.au/conferences/herdsa

Or from the Conference Secretariat
Tel (61 8) 9386 3282
Email: herds@debretts.com.au
Dear colleagues,

We want to draw your attention to the following conferences which will take place in Vienna. They address topics of considerable importance for the current debate on higher education:

**14th International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education (AQHE)**
22nd-24th July 2002, University of Vienna
For details please visit our homepage: http://www.iff.ac.at/hofo
Conference web site: http://www.gcal.ac.uk/conferences/events/220702.html

**21st International Seminar on Staff and Educational Development (ISSED)**
24th-26th July 2002, University of Vienna
For details please visit our homepage: http://www.iff.ac.at/hofo
Conference web site: http://www.gcal.ac.uk/conferences/events/240702.html

Both events are hosted by the Glasgow Caledonian University and the Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of Austrian Universities (IFF).

**15th CHER Annual Conference. "Higher Education in the Global Age."**
5th - 7th September 2002, in co-operation with the University of Vienna
For details please visit our homepage: http://www.iff.ac.at/hofo

We are looking forward to an inspiring debate, that will compare various national experiences in an international context and would be very glad to welcome you in Vienna.

Best regards
Ada Pellert and Thomas Pfeffer

IFF (Institute for Interdisciplinary Studies of Austrian Universities)
Center for Research in Higher Education
Schottenfeldgasse 29, A-1070 Vienna
Tel.: ++43 1 522 4000-121
Fax: ++43 1 522 4000-178
Email: hochschulforschung@iff.ac.at