Producing Pedagogy

Producing Pedagogy

By

Lorelle Burton, Jill Lawrence,
Ann Dashwood and Alice Brown

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

FOREWORD

In 1963 the Western world was rocked by a scandal of unprecedented proportions. Five senior British diplomats and civil servants were charged with espionage. The five: Kim Philby, Donald Maclean, Guy Burgess, Anthony Blunt and a fifth individual whose identity remains unknown were charged with selling top secrets to the Soviet Union. Whatever success had been achieved in offsetting the problems of the Cold War suffered an immediate and immense setback with the announcement of the scandal.

What, you may be wondering, does this notorious incident have to do with a new book on pedagogical development in an Australian university?

Consider this. Philby and his co-conspirators had all attended Cambridge University, where they became acquainted with each other and in fact became known in later years as the "Cambridge Five".

And consider this. The most fundamental Cambridge value is *Freedom of thought and expression*. And the uppermost Cambridge educational principle is, *The encouragement of a questioning spirit*. All Cambridge Dons are expected to emphasise this particular value and associated educational principle in their teaching, and all Cambridge students are expected to demonstrate their essence in their learning.

Indeed, Philby credited his Cambridge experience with the development of his intense questioning of Western liberal democracy and his orientation to subversive political expression. Such, it would seem, is the remarkable potency of a centre for advanced thought when its leaders make a decision about how teaching and learning should be undertaken and its academics follow through in authentic ways in their pedagogical methods.

Consideration of this rather colourful Cambridge exemplar is incomplete without a final footnote. The University Board of Governors might well have backed away, following 1963, from a pedagogical philosophy that seemingly brought embarrassment, if not the hint of disgrace, to one of the world's most venerable institutions. But they did not. Indeed, Cambridge has gone from strength to strength in the ensuing decades and is currently ranked by some agencies as the world's leading university. And its core *Freedom of Thought and Expression* value and its *Questioning Spirit* educational principle remain very firmly intact, with an expectation that they will shape the teaching of all academics and the

learning of all students.

Most modern institutes for higher learning, including Australia's 40 universities, have traditionally lacked whatever it takes to develop a highly meaningful vision and then transpose that vision into pedagogical practices à la Cambridge. Rather, the norm for most universities has seemed to be: use a PR company to develop a slick vision that has presumed marketing power and leave it to individual academics to teach in accordance with their individual capabilities, whatever they may be. And why not? The development, and implementation, of an institutional pedagogy out of a pedagogically-driven University vision statement invariably requires that academics give up a degree of their scholarly freedom and that they work collaboratively, across discipline boundaries, to develop university-wide pedagogical principles that are grounded more in the need of their University than in their individual specialisations and interests. Very few Vice Chancellors and University Councils, in my experience, are prepared to undertake such a massive developmental challenge.

Moreover, of course, there is the "Cambridge question" – Why impose a pedagogical framework on an entire university when, if you get it wrong, you can do untold damage? Much less dangerous, surely, to just let your academics do their own thing. Your university may never become a Cambridge or Harvard, but life will be peaceful.

Which brings me to this book. It is an historical account. It is a research analysis. It is a multi-biographical narrative. It is a pronouncement of educational philosophy. It is in fact all of these things, and perhaps more since it captures with remarkable clarity an event, in longitudinal perspective, that is quite remarkably unique. All in all, it is an extraordinary book.

Perhaps more than anything else, the book reveals something of the true meaning and importance of scholarly collaboration in an Australian setting. The four University of Southern Queensland co-authors were involved in the initial decision, in 2005, to give pedagogical meaning to their University's visionary construct of "transnational". They were involved in the developmental processes of the Mission taken up by the Vice Chancellor but made difficult through the retirement of senior administrators and later myself. They organised and conducted the significant research initiatives into the outcomes of earlier developmental work; and they wrote, validated and edited the chapters that follow. Their undertaking was massive and surely could not have been achieved without the highest level of mutual respect and trust. No doubt they are all much better professionals, colleagues and friends for this experience.

Let me comment also on some of the five pedagogical principles that emerged from exploration of the University's *Transnational* vision: *Sustainability; Flexibility; Scholarship; Engagement; Context.*

On the surface, these five principles would appear to lack the potential cognitive and affective impact of, say, Cambridge's *Questioning Spirit.* But a pedagogical framework that demands of academics that they think about, and nurture, *Sustainability* is surely extremely provoking in any university context; but especially so in a conservative environment such as Toowoomba, where huge demographic changes are underway – partly as a result of African refugee settlements- and a number of global and national energy industries have their headquarters. But there is more. Currently about 25%, 6500 of the university's 27000 students, are international, mostly studying online at a distance. A pedagogical principle such as *Context,* once endorsed for institution-wide usage, imposes expectations on lecturers in the first instance and students from around the world in the second instance that must surely nurture heightened thought, deepened values analysis and enriched cross-cultural relationships. One can only conclude, therefore, that what USQ has achieved, and what the four authors have captured, is a level of scholarly depth that may well be unique in contemporary Australian universities.

Finally, the book is both a beautifully written narrative and a highly credible research report. The consistency of the writing style across chapters is very impressive, given the size of the writing team. But equally impressive is the powerful data base, gained mainly from carefully constructed surveys and personal narratives. What emerges is a strong support for the fundamental construct of University-wide pedagogy, based on the perceptions of staff and students that might be regarded as surprising if it weren't so convincing.

Because of my involvement in 2005 with the origins of the USQ Transnational Pedagogy Project in my role as a Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement & Social Justice), I have a special interest in this publication. But the Project belongs to the authors of this book, just as much as the book itself does.

To the authors, one and all-Australian universities aren't usually known for their innovative pedagogical practice. But you have shown that there is indeed an ingenious side to the work of at least one of our higher education institutes, namely the University of Southern Queensland. You have shown that intense scholarly analysis, authentic ingenuity and rich collaboration are alive and well. Congratulations. You are an inspiration.

—Emeritus Professor Frank Crowther, AM.

PREFACE

Higher education globally is operating in a highly volatile context, a consequence of the rapid globalisation and intense technological change characteristic of the early 21st century. These forces challenge assumptions about work, productivity, and international demand for knowledge, skills and resources, igniting needs for highly competent and educated graduates. Then there are equity demands about wider access to higher levels of training and higher education for personal growth as well as demands to advance national goals of innovation and technology in a changing world. At the same time, levels of government scrutiny and reporting are increasing, external quality audits are in place and external pressures for change are escalating. As Geoff Scott, Hamish Coates and Michelle Anderson argue in their 2008 Australian Council of Educational Research Report, funding per capita is decreasing while competition is increasing; institutions are more commercial; students are more numerous, diverse and forthright about getting value for money paid; and concurrently, rapid developments in Information and Communication Technologies have made possible modes and approaches to learning unimagined 30 years ago. For instance, there is a proliferation of sources of education, think of the massive open online courses (MOOCs), and open educational resources (OERs),and an increasing blending of various technologies, particularly digital, in delivery, management and support.

Regional and local change forces exacerbate the current volatility. These include the need to manage the pressures for continuous change while simultaneously dealing with slow and unresponsive administrative processes. There are also challenges in finding and retaining high-quality staff, recruiting students in unpredictable economic times, meeting the requirements for increased government reporting, and balancing work and family life for both staff and students. Questions are generated about the extent to which the University is the traditional place where new knowledge is created and, according to Scott, Coates and Anderson in their preface, where learning is equated with the transmission of set content using a "one-size-fits-all" model delivered in lecture theatres, tutorials, and laboratories on a set timetable operated at the institution's convenience over fixed semesters.

To remain viable, universities have to build their capacity to respond promptly, positively and wisely to these interlaced combinations of "change forces". One answer is the instigation of an institutional learning and teaching redesign to enhance quality and promote good practice: a redesign capable of meeting future learning needs in the 21st century. However, efforts to develop capability in relation to learning and teaching vary widely across institutions. While some institutions focus on further developing individuals' knowledge and skills within their discipline, others provide an additional learning and teaching framework to build institutional knowledge and capabilities and connect them to the university's strategic plan. This book focuses on the second approach. Taking a longitudinal perspective, covering seven years and three separate research projects, the book describes the development and subsequent evaluation of a whole-of-institution approach to pedagogy.

Producing pedagogy presents nine chapters peer reviewed by esteemed colleagues and international experts in the fields of learning and teaching and higher education research and development. Chapter One sets the scene by outlining the development and adaptation of a whole-of-institution pedagogy at the University of Southern Queensland (USQ), a regional university in Queensland, Australia. The chapter explains how a project team developed the rationale for an institutional pedagogy based on five associated pedagogical principles: Sustainability, Engagement, Scholarship, Flexibility, and Contextual Learning. Chapter Two reviews the literature underpinning each of those principles.

The initial impetus to produce the pedagogy was USQ's 2005 vision to be Australia's leading transnational educator. However two years later, USQ's vision changed to an emphasis on a commitment to sustainability and flexibility. The *transnational pedagogy* became a *best practice learning and teaching pedagogy*. The research team was able to accommodate this change, as well as the others which were to follow, because of the applicability and continued relevance of the five principles in relation to USQ's strategic planning, and to the higher education literature.

Chapters Three, Four, and Five report the findings of a research study conducted to investigate the applicability of the five principles to both students and staff in the USQ context. The research process and student results are documented in ChaptersThree (the quantitative results) and Four (the qualitative results) while Chapter Five specifically investigates the students' perceptions and experiences of the Contextual Learning principle. Chapter Six discusses the staff results (both the quantitative and qualitative).

In 2010 the authors were awarded a USQ Fellowship to develop an on-line questionnaire, the Self-Assessment of Learning and Teaching (SALT) tool, with inbuilt sources of information and support. The online SALT platform was designed to facilitate capacity-building among USQ academic staff using the five principles as a framework. The platform enabled staff to reflect, prioritise, and develop their learning and teaching design and delivery capacities in line with the principles described in this book. Chapter Seven outlines how the fellowship project, including how the SALT platform was developed and piloted. The chapter augments understandings already developed about the efficacy of two of the five pedagogical principles–Engagement and Scholarship. Chapters Eight and Nine enhance understandings in relation to the other three principles.

The final chapter, Chapter Nine, also reflects on the journey undertaken by the project team. The journey is contextualised against both USQ and Australian higher education imperatives to draw out threads related to the rapid changes impacting on higher education, in particular technological innovation, managerial governance, and quality assurance. In so doing, the chapter reviews the applicability of the five principles in constituting the core of a pedagogical approach. The approach needs to retain its relevance and be agile enough to respond ably to rapid and complex shifts in the contemporary higher education environment. Chapter Nine thus anticipates a conceptual framework for developing a relevant, responsive, and agile institutional pedagogy.

This refereed volume provides an opportunity to gain insights about the development of pedagogy in a regional university as well as its capacity to reflect and to build staff and student knowledge, skills, and capabilities and connect them to the university's strategic plan.

—Jill Lawrence

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CHAPTER ONE

THE JOURNEY: AN INSTITUTIONAL PEDAGOGY IN THE MAKING

ANN DASHWOOD, JILL LAWRENCE, LORELLE BURTON, AND ALICE BROWN

Introduction

In 2005, the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) announced its vision to be *Australia's leading transnational university*. With the term "transnational" open to interpretation, the incumbent Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice) initiated a project team to define a transnational pedagogy for USQ. The transnational project (TP) team was drawn from across the University, comprising Excellence in Teaching Award winners and noted teachers nominated by their faculties. The team had two aims: to identify pedagogical practices that were transnational in nature; and to describe good practices in teaching and learning that exemplified "transnational pedagogy" in an Australian tertiary institution.

This chapter documents the TP team's journey in exploring uncontested knowledge and multiple perspectives to reach consensus for defining an approach to transnational teaching and learning. The goal was to produce a statement of principles to serve as the University's teaching mission. Research could then evaluate the efficacy of this framework by identifying perceptions that academics and students held about the principles. Re-examining teaching and learning this way enabled the team to reproblematise the legitimacy of dominant assumptions and evolve new paradigms. The morphing of past practice into a pedagogy which has been ecologically modified for the digital era is part of the scholarship of teaching and learning presented here.

Higher Education Perspectives

A university's managerial and administrative functions are more likely to define its leadership than the pedagogy it represents. Crowther and Burton (2007) argued that "traditional conceptions of university leadership, with their emphasis on strategic and managerial processes, are difficult to reconcile with developmental initiatives such as generation of an institutional pedagogy" (p. 11). In this process, academics function independently as in the past, without an explicit pedagogy (Crowther & Burton, 2007). Crowther and Burton (2007) asserted that a distributed leadership approach, this time through pedagogical functions, was an alternative. This approach empowers staff to own the pedagogical process. However it does have some risks, including the possibility that the vision could be wrong and that academics are directed to function on a flawed premise (Crowther & Burton, 2007).

Recent years have seen an international trend towards enhanced teaching and learning effectiveness in universities. Sorcinelli and Austin (2006, as cited in Crowther & Burton, 2007) used Senge's (1990) concept of a "learning organisation" as evidenced by faculty development in North America. The most effective institutions for the future are those "that approach educational development as collaborative, community work" (Sorenson, 2006, p. 21) and are engaged in authentic teaching (Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995). These initiatives highlighted the responsibility of higher education to contribute to the quality of community life and democratic capacity. Holland (2005) claimed that engaged scholarship with engaged teaching and learning was "to be a force for institutional change and diversity" (p. 12). Higher education had to relate to the wider world. The Australian Commonwealth Government introduced reforms aimed at enhancing university teaching, primarily through funding incentives (Rivers, 2004). Universities around Australia called for plans to convert a "real world learning" vision into authentic student experiences (Young, 2006, as cited in Crowther & Burton 2007):

> We are turning the traditional learning model around. We will be delivering a practical problem for all students to start their studies with and through which students learn all their theoretical knowledge. So you engage students – they learn by doing things rather than being told things. (p. 6)

Conceptual Framework

The TP team used a genealogical approach. Genealogy is a relatively new methodology which looks to conceptualise current problems differently from how traditional or revisionist histories have understood them (Macfarlane and Lewis 2004). Michel Foucault (1986) introduced this method, distinguishing it from traditional history by insisting on its ability to affirm all knowledge as perspective. According to Foucault, genealogy became a way to write "the history of the present"–a diagnostic tool that foregrounds the cultural practices that have constituted us as subjects (as cited in Macfarlane & Lewis, 2004, p. 55).

Genealogy inquires into the processes, procedures, and techniques which produce truth, knowledge, and beliefs (Meadmore, Hatcher, & McWilliam 2000). This method makes participants uncomfortable, so that through shared dialogue and philosophical inquiry, and by exploring concepts, values, and positions, they can become more comfortable. McWilliam (2004) suggested this methodology allows us to view problems differently, as it is neither judgemental nor problem-solving, but uses a detached evaluation and assessment through multiple perspectives.

Methodology

The genealogical approach enabled the TP team to revisit a number of their uncontested ways of knowing in relation to (a) pedagogical practices that were "transnational", and (b) criteria for good practice in teaching and learning that exemplified "transnational pedagogy" in Australia. The process questioned legitimacy of the status quo thereby allowing established paradigms and "particular truths" to be dismantled and viewed through a "new lens" (Meadmore et al., 2000, p. 465). Through this process, the team discovered new knowledge and understandings of transnational pedagogy.

The concept of "transnational pedagogy" is problematic as it has a number of different and conflicting meanings in the higher education context (see Stage 2 below). The genealogical approach allowed the TP team to test ideas and shape a shared understanding of the concept.

The TP team set out to define USQ's transnational pedagogy by operationalising the transnational agenda for local and global higher educational goals. The genealogical approach acted as a diagnostic tool to problematise the stages along the journey, using consultation and collaboration throughout. The six stages included: problematising, reflecting on past and present practices, re-evaluating truths, developing

shared understandings, evolving processes, and identifying future possibilities (Tamboukou, 2003). The process of collaborating across the University and conceptualising a framework of transnational teaching and learning developed into an historical record of how learning and teaching principles have evolved with time across the USQ community.

The Project Team Participants

There were 15 members of the TP team (see Crowther et al., 2005). That many of the team were USQ Teaching Excellence Award winners reflected advancements, documented above, in learning and teaching at the national level. For example, the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (2006) set benchmarks for university teaching quality, attributing quality to academic programs that were exemplars of the following four characteristics: (a) distinctiveness, coherence, and clarity of purpose; (b) positive influence on student learning and student engagement; (c) breadth of impact; and (d) concern for equity and diversity. In 2006 and 2007 at USQ, ten individuals and/or teams received Carrick Institute Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning while five individuals and/or teams received Carrick Awards for Australian University Teaching. Four members of the TP team were both Carrick Citation and Award winners. Qualities of transnational pedagogy are also inherent in the Carrick awardees' teaching and learning philosophies and practices. Defining transparency of good practice in local and global contexts, as recognised by the Carrick Institute, and determining the extent to which USQ embedded those characteristics in its programs, provided a focus for the transnational pedagogy journey.

The Transnational Journey

The TP team met several times throughout 2005 and 2006 for 2-hour sessions of face-to-face informal gatherings. Between meetings, electronic postings allowed the participants to review and reflect on their proposals. Ideas were proposed, shared, questioned, debated, recorded, and reviewed during the meetings. The process interconnected with the genealogical approach as it sought to inquire into the processes, procedures, and techniques which produce knowledge (Meadmore et al., 2000; Williams, 2005). The six stages of the process are outlined below.

Stage 1: Problematisation

This stage identifies and isolates the problem (Tamboukou, 1999; 2003). Knowledge assumptions of truth were subjected to inquiry and contested (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1998; Hook, 2001). Tamboukou (2003) argued a kind of "socially shared 'discomfort' about how things are going" initiates this stage (p. 18). The team problematised the concept of transnational pedagogy, then set themselves the task of defining its principles and strategies for USQ.

The rationale the team accepted encompassed the ideas that:

1. The USQ vision as *Australia's leading transnational educator* explicitly promotes the concept of balancing global/regional values in all aspects of our daily work. The implications for our professional practice were deemed worth teasing out.
2. The concept of "transnational education" manifests a responsible, futuristic concern for global well-being and sustainability–something we care about very much and want to fully reflect in our work.
3. Creating a better picture of what transnational pedagogy meant would provide a practical way to communicate USQ's distinctive mandate to all members of the community, particularly our students and prospective students.
4. Heightened educational outcomes are inextricably linked to agreement about, and shared responsibility for, teaching, learning, and assessment processes.
5. Clarifying a concept like transnational pedagogy would provide a meaningful basis for shared learning and professional development across USQ.

Other universities had attempted to develop frameworks for international pedagogical processes, but few had been satisfied with the results, as far as we knew (see next section). At a time when all Australian universities were being challenged to explicate their pedagogical capabilities and practices, why would we not accept this compelling challenge? The TP team's task was thus to develop and circulate their own understanding of transnational pedagogy.

Stage 2: Reflection on Past and Present Practices

In this stage, the TP team reflected on their past and present practices. The aim was to question dominant discourses and understandings (Hook, 2001). By exploring understandings at the site (the University) where ethics (rules and expectations) or styles of living (practices) interface, current understandings (uncontested truths, centres of power) are revealed, made transparent, and deconstructed (Williams, 2005). Williams (2005) suggested that it involves:

> The drawing up of a *dispositif* showing the relationship to the 'problem' of the various phenomena constituting it; the latter should include any uncontested 'truths', all centres of power, and the bodies of any individuals involved as the site where their ethics (or style of living) interface with the world. (p. 725)

This reflective stage required reviewing the literature on the concept of "transnational", a step frequently revisited throughout the process and in fact throughout the whole journey. Initially two main strands emerged. The first was a big picture view equating transnational pedagogy with good practice and inclusive teaching. The second equated transnational with offshore teaching. Jackson (2003) articulated the first understanding, stating that many Western universities were responding to the demands of globalisation by introducing an element of multiculturalism to their curricula. Jackson isolated three main assumptions in this process: (a) globalisation is a viable agenda for a sustainable and just future for all people; (b) the university is obligated to respond faithfully to current demands of western society, in this case for globalisation; and (c) given the first two assumptions, internationalising the curriculum is a logical response. Jackson argued that we must recognise and question the first two assumptions, to challenge the foundational concepts of contemporary Western civilisation. The core concepts of other cultures may be an asset in this process, giving an entirely new meaning to the term "internationalisation of the curriculum" (Jackson, 2003). Chapter Nine will continue to explore this argument, revitalising it with the contemporary literature.

The University of South Australia (UniSA), an established transnational educator, proceeded with the assumptions put forward by Jackson (2003). At the UniSA, transnational education had become well established with Australian academics teaching students in their local contexts, face-to-face, and offshore. The meaning of transnational education at UniSA included taking courses and programs and teaching them overseas. UniSA offered courses offshore with local tutors from

participating partner institutions, raising many issues for academics. For example, cultural and educational experiences of students based in Asian countries raised a wider range of expectations, however teachers had to explain to students that "the process of learning is just as important as the content" (UniSA, 2007, p. 1) and that they had to be encouraged to engage with content and process as a scholarly activity using their higher learning skills. Preparation of material, with meaningful assessment tasks, was coupled with an effort to "show empathy for your students, develop effective relationships with students, stimulate the flow of ideas, and encourage, challenge, support, listen and model" (UniSA, 2007, p. 1). It was not sufficient to replicate the textual material delivered in Australia. Elsewhere, the University of Western Australia saw its offshore programs in terms of the impact of culture on learning, considering diverse student needs and capabilities, teacher perspectives, and determining how best to design and deliver appropriate learning materials and library services (Thompson, 2003).

The second and more salient strand effectively delineated between the terms "transnational" and "pedagogy", given that strategic directions many universities were taking at that time equated transnational with offshore teaching. Monash University, for example, had in place transnational quality assurance practices with institutions and companies abroad. Shoemaker (2008) later argued that Monash had gone further down this road than any other Australian university, expanding to include campuses in South Africa and Malaysia. Swinburne University of Technology, Curtin University and the University of Wollongong also followed this path. The rationale included the provision of the institution's programs through direct contact with faculty staff and facilities, rather than surrendering the responsibility to private offshore course providers who may also offer courses approved by rival institutions. Potential students are also able to study at a much lesser cost than studying in Australia.

This reflective stage for the TP team involved reviewing the literature on the concept of "pedagogy". Pedagogy, the art and science of education, ranges from skills acquisition (Gagne, 1965) to the full development of the human being (Bernstein, 2000) to critical pedagogy (Freire, 1970). It utilises a framework under which teachers choose and develop cognitive strategies in relation to the discipline they are teaching, the quality of learning environment they develop, while taking into account the learning styles and backgrounds of their students, and the level of authentic assessment. Also involved is consideration of their own philosophy and array of teaching strategies as well as their capacity to select and apply those most appropriate (Department of Education, Training and Employment,

2004). Chapter Nine revisits this literature, considering ongoing change in contemporary education.

Stage 3: Re-Evaluation of Truths

Questioning was fundamental to this stage, prioritising questions about "where are we" and "where can we go" (Henriques et al., 1998). Williams (2005) spoke of the need to pose challenging questions with detachment and meticulous scrutiny, both textual and non-textual. This stage privileges "how" over "why" questions in the historical analysis of the "problem", and concentrates on its "conditions of possibility".

Subsequent meetings further questioned the TP team's knowledge assumptions. Questions such as "which strand of research reflects the group's evolving understandings of transnational?" were fundamental, and, if the group were to take the first view of equating transnational pedagogy with good practice, it had to consider what this meant for pedagogy at USQ. At UniSA, for example, Leask (2004) found that local staff offshore, from partner organisations, collaborated in the teaching support to visiting lecturers and the students. They usually shared the language and educational backgrounds of the students and were key mediators of the curriculum. USQ confronts similar challenges. Teachers have to manage heavy workloads and large classes, often within severe time constraints. They must also build relationships with new students and bridge the "cultural gap" with students. They must adapt content delivery for the offshore cohort and use more effective communication skills to encourage interactivity in classes. Students must boost their assertiveness and teachers must teach conventions of referencing to avoid plagiarism. Adequate resources are essential to this process.

This questioning process contributed to the TP team's understandings of transnational as exemplifying "distributed leadership". This stage achieved congruence by the team collaborating to define transnational pedagogy at USQ. Transnational was thus defined as "globally located" anywhere that USQ students were studying, either online, on-campus, or by distance education. It began with local in Toowoomba, to trans-continental within Australia reaching interstate rural and urban locations, inter-continental to Asia, North America and Europe, and trans-oceanic to the Pacific and island neighbours.

Stage 4: Development of Shared Understandings

It is important to arrive at a shared meaning that is fluid and evolving; to generate a new understanding developed from a conglomeration of shared discursive forms (Henriques et al., 1998). Henriques et al. (1998) stated that "it is then possible to put together a new proposal for the present that takes account of all the different discursive forms which went into the making of the original concept" (p. 100).

Having arrived at a shared meaning of transnational, the team set out to define "USQ pedagogy". The team concurred that "good teaching practice" represented the pedagogy and that they would need to circulate any agreed definition of "transnational pedagogy" across the University community for comment. Within the team, views were made known and supporting evidence identified. The following debate was often based on establishing priorities rather than rejections. When a concept had been sufficiently clarified, consensus was reached and it became part of that meeting's unfolding clarification of the pedagogy based on good practice among colleagues.

The learning and teaching goals the TP team identified included: showing respect for students, possessing a passion for teaching and learning, showing insight into existing skills and knowledge, clarifying student and teacher expectations, communicating effectively, actively engaging students in learning, providing a cross-cultural perspective, reflecting continuously on one's teaching, being open to change, and collaborating with colleagues. The team redeveloped the definition of "transnational" and put forward ideas on the "pedagogy" that best described good practice at USQ. They put these ideas into two categories. First, they outlined the principles of teaching practice. Second, they described the strategies for implementing enhanced learning.

Stage 5: Evolution of Processes

Hook (2001) argued that the last principle of genealogical methodology is exteriority. Thus, "that in analysis the apparent meaning of a discourse must give way before the external conditions of its possibility" (Hook, 2001, p. 538). Williams (2005) maintained that this stage is a combination of detachment and meticulous scrutiny. To disseminate the pedagogy to the broader USQ community, the TP team presented the proposed USQ transnational principles and strategies at a number of USQ forums through 2005 and 2006. The principles were also presented to an international forum and through consultation and research meetings held in 2007.

In the first stage of dissemination, the academic community met to discuss the principles. This was an initial step to obtain the University's endorsement and embed them as the basis of transnational pedagogy at USQ. The group felt that putting the principles into action required exemplars of good practice. The TP team had to provide evidence of good practice which had been formally acknowledged. As a result, the TP team put together exemplars of best practice from across their various disciplines.

The team chose the USQ common hour to communicate the principles and strategies. The forum goals were two-fold: (a) to present the concept to the USQ academic community, and (b) to communicate the journey of identifying a transnational pedagogy framework. The team defined the key concepts, with exemplars added to provide discipline-specific input. Individuals in the audience were then invited to provide input, providing personal exemplars and raising questions about the stated vision. Written comments were canvassed and the feedback collated, and then reviewed by a small subgroup. A second presentation was made to an international forum held at USQ in December 2005 by then Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice), with break-out groups including team members. The concepts encapsulated an orientation to strategic teaching rather than a prescription for ways in which specific disciplines might implement each strategy.

Each public forum outlined the essential characteristics of the major principles, in order to identify teaching strategies that would give them authenticity. This helped problematise the principles and strategies of transnational pedagogy for newcomers, who were often key stakeholders (e.g., USQ policy makers). Each presentation received questioning and sometimes hostile feedback. A major issue was a perception that "transnational" meant shifting USQ's priority from local to global orientation of student needs. There was concern that the image presented should not be the definitive direction for USQ. Second, some believed that a documented statement of a "transnational pedagogy" would not be sustained in practice. This would bring USQ into contempt if it was shown that the University did not meet its marketed image.

The consultation process enabled the TP team to reshape the initial principles and strategies. The five key principles that evolved included:

1. *The Sustainability Principle:* USQ embraces the ability to meet present needs within a code of ethical practice without compromising the ability to meet future needs.

2. *The Engagement Principle***:** USQ fosters engagement and collaboration. Engagement means participating in interactive exchanges of knowledge. Collaboration means working creatively in partnerships: student-to-student and teacher-to-student.
3. *The Scholarship Principle***:** USQ respects diverse learning and teaching styles and upholds excellence and integrity of scholarship across disciplines.
4. *The Flexibility Principle***:** USQ accepts individual and collective responsibility in providing supportive, inclusive, and flexible learning environments.
5. *The Contextual Principle***:** USQ recognises and values students' backgrounds and contexts.

The team reconvened after the presentations to the wider University community to determine how to embed transnational pedagogy into future teaching protocols and practices. A position chapter was presented to University Council and was endorsed in November 2005. The Vice-Chancellor's Executive Committee unanimously endorsed it on July 6, 2006 (USQ, 2006) and it appeared in the USQ vision statement posted on the USQ homepage in 2007.

Stage 6: Identification of Future Possibilities

Williams (2005) suggested that the final stage involves identifying future possibilities and political choices as a direct result of analysing a problem, identifying and isolating new problems (Tamboukou, 2003) to be later contested (Henriques et al., 1998). For the team, this final stage meant choosing whether to continue the process. Some members ended their involvement here, although papers were presented at international conferences the following year.

The endorsement of the transnational pedagogy problematised new concerns for the remaining members.

Tamboukou's (2003, p. 18) notion of "socially shared 'discomfort' about how things are going" was re-established in relation to three key areas: dissemination, implementation, and research. They following issues were identified:

1. There was no precedent at USQ for an organisation-wide initiative based on the concept of "alignment". It was not part

of the conscious academic thinking at USQ and was contrary to some perspectives on academic freedom and autonomy.

2. There was a "risk" factor if the University vision was "wrong" (Crowther & Burton, 2007).

3. Moreover, there was the issue of whether it was mandatory to include the University's pedagogical framework as a basic ingredient of its marketing strategies (Crowther & Burton, 2007). USQ marketing investigations of the role of value-adding in the market have found that connectedness to the institution was an imperative in students' decision-making (I. Olton, personal communication, June 25 2007).

4. USQ's marketing division had historically created its own marketing strategies, including underlying values, without input from academic staff. The question of whether the transnational concept was compelling enough to drive USQ's marketing strategy remained unanswered.

5. Extensive university-wide professional development would be required to familiarise staff with the rationale for transnational pedagogy and to develop familiarity with the principles and strategies.

6. Workload issues were likely to arise when staff engaged in collaborative planning and collaborative professional learning.

7. Reward systems would need to be aligned with Carrick Institute Award processes for staff who demonstrate success in implementing the University vision through their pedagogical practices.

These issues were resolved in various ways. The challenges raised in the first three issues are discussed further in Chapter Nine. Whether a consequence of the negative feedback or more reflective of the technological shifts increasingly impacting on the higher education sector, the transnational label was superseded in 2007 with changes in USQ's institutional strategic directions, a development alleviating the concerns raised above (issue 4). Professional development and workload issues (issues 5 and 6) continue to be ongoing while the reward systems (issue 7) have been implemented.

Moving Forward: The Next Steps

The TP team disbanded in late 2006, its role having come to an end. However the Director of the Centre for Research in Transformative

Pedagogies, based in the Faculty of Education, was invited to respond to the University-endorsed statement on transnational pedagogy. The research centre was to prioritise research related to transnational pedagogy. The outcomes included a research plan to conduct funded research, collecting evidence of the community's understanding of notions surrounding transnational pedagogy related to their program.

Early in 2007, Dr Burton called a research meeting to gather individual and collective interest in the notion of surveying transnational pedagogy. One group, focused around a Faculty of Education research grant and comprising the authors of this book, developed an online survey instrument to be used in semesters two and three (2007) to gather a university wide concept from students and staff about the extent to which learning and teaching at USQ are transnational. The survey items were based on the principles outlined by the TP team. The research group developed one version of the survey for students and one for academic staff. The student survey was disseminated in September 2007 and the academic staff survey in February 2008. The results are reported in Chapters Three, Four and Five of this book. A Self-Assessment of Learning and Teaching (SALT) matrix was later developed in 2010 on the five key principles of pedagogy in the higher education sector and reviewed by academics in focus groups. Their responses are reflected in Chapters Seven and Eight, respectively.

Conclusion

The journey of the TP team in using the genealogical process to define the concept of "transnational pedagogy" was at first troubling then rewarding. Higher education practice had evolved from traditional face-to-face practice to offering courses offshore, a shift which caused the project team to rethink the shared understandings of key principles of higher education going forward. The use of the genealogical approach instigated an awareness of pedagogical practices from changing from being "transnational" in nature to embracing an evolving pedagogy for the ever changing times. This approach also extended ways of identifying good practice in teaching and learning. USQ had thus developed an educational vision to underpin its transnational mission. The stages of the journey overviewed in this chapter also involved disseminating the pedagogy to the faculties and identifying strategic directions in pedagogical practice within existing University frameworks. It also meant shaping research tools to inform practice that connects the intellectual demands of a

campus-based pedagogy with the demands of distance education across digital domains.

From this point the ongoing productive pedagogy journey involved establishing the University's teaching practices around five principles. It was intended that the principles be embedded into course resources that reflected the roles of teachers, learners and materials in an era of globalisation. The team envisaged that, as the principles were put into practice, the University would become distinctive in the Australian higher education sector for the transnational pedagogy it had constructed. The future journey would be prospective, based on a process of introspection, analysis, integration, innovation, and improvement (Crowther et al., 2005). Research findings within the University and with international partners would also continue to inform the transnational pedagogy genre. It was also hoped that a pilot study of USQ students and academics would provide the catalyst for assessing the framework. A key question would be to determine how teachers recognised in their practices the principles of transnational teaching and learning and to understand the extent to which students perceived the pedagogy benefited their learning. Chapter Two describes the theoretical perspectives underlying the concepts developed by the TP team. The chapter explains how a newer and smaller research team (consisting of the four authors of this book) reviewed the five principles to explore how they were perceived in USQ's learning and teaching work.

References

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique* (Rev. ed.). London: Rowman & Littlefield.

Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. (2006). *Carrick awards for Australian university teaching: Awards for programs that enhance learning: Promoting and advancing learning and teaching in Australian higher education.* Retrieved August 30, 2007, from
http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/home/awards/pid/60

Crowther, F., Behjat, N., Birch, D., Brodie, L., Burton, L., Connors, B., Cretchley, P., Dashwood, A., Hoey, A., Lawrence, J., Brown, A., Locke, J., Maroulis, J., Smith, A. and Wood, D. (2005). *Transnational pedagogy: A stimulus paper for consideration by the USQ professional community.* Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.