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Chapter 1: Teachers, Teaching and Education Reform: Breaking the Intransigence of the Sector

Richard Smith and David Lynch

Is it not ironical that in a planned society of controlled workers given compulsory assignments, where religious expression is suppressed, the press controlled, and all media of communication censored, where a puppet government is encouraged but denied any real authority, where great attention is given to efficiency and character reports, and attendance at cultural assemblies is compulsory, where it is avowed that all will be administered to each according to his needs and performance required from each according to his abilities and where those who flee are tracked down returned and punished for trying to escape – in short in the milieu of the typical large American secondary school --- we attempt to teach ‘the democratic system’. (Van Norman, 1966)

Doubtless, many Australian educators would share van Norman’s cynicism about the concept and content of the ‘school’, whether or not they prize the ‘democratic system’. Many Australian education inquiries and reports have signalled the need for change. Yet, surveying the ways in which educational institutions operate, there appears to be little fundamental change since van Norman penned his anguish.

The national debate about the performance of school systems engendered by NAPLAN and PISA comparisons has, in the consciousness of professional and the public alike, magnified the impact of globalisation and politico-economic shifts in world power. Australia faces increased efforts to reform the education system to serve purposes that are claimed to lie at the heart of survival in a dangerous, new world, while maintaining all that is good and pure from the past.

In this world education is both a partial cause of concern about Australia’s position and a full-blown remedy for the new situations predicted for the future. The problem is centrally defined as the
perceived ordinariness of school, VET and university performance compared to global trading partners. Critics point particularly at what they identify as lowered expectations and standards, especially for teacher recruitment and teaching effectiveness. In turn, the argument goes, there are flow-on effects across the education system and in turn, to the quality of life. The pundits have plenty of solutions: pay teaching staff more, pay the best teachers even more, test the performance of teachers, train different kinds of entrants for school teaching, reform preparation for teaching at all levels, toughen up higher education entry levels and invest more resources in training.

These proposed reforms assume that what education institutions and teachers do is an orderly, technical process that can be adjusted here and there and primed with dollars. They have faith in the simple notion of get the processes right and the institutions will produce graduates full of energy and knowledge. They also assume that teachers and teaching are where the problem lies while ignoring the severity of institutional restrictions on teachers both as individuals and as a profession.

Yet from Prime Ministers, to state governments, newspaper editors, television commentators, talk-back radio jocks, blogs and newspaper letters-to-the-editor columns, earnest comments about education are more often than not piecemeal, a historical and misdirected. They persistently ignore the fundamental reasons for real and perceived education shortfalls and the fact that many of the imagined solutions have been tried before.

These reasons include the declining authority of teachers at all levels as a consequence of policies such as equity programs that impose judicial and regulatory frameworks on teachers and undermine their legitimacy in contrast to students. There is the constant questioning of the teacher’s authority by administrative fiat and public comment in a changing society. Lack of vision and will to make fundamental changes on the part of the state play a major role as politicians are subjected to constant elections directed by social media and the helplessness of the modern state to steer in a global context.

Above all, since the Second World War, even if there were the will and capacity to change education institutions so that student
achievements improve, a store of robust usable knowledge that an education reformer could use with justifiable certainty was missing. Historically reformers have floundered with instruction and how teaching and classrooms work as they were persuaded to use this or that brand of snake oil (Cuban, 1984). Indeed, while there has been a host of efforts to change classroom instruction based on a multitude of ‘theories’, especially those of an individualised variety derived from North American psychology and European sociology, educational reform is surrounded by debris and false promises. Under these circumstances, teachers have acted professionally by doggedly and persistently sticking to such maligned elements as teacher-centred instruction and other adaptive strategies that enable them to survive and for the system to endure.

The reasons for failure have an additional dimension that is irrevocably connected to excluding teachers from the desired reforms so that imposition is preferred to collaboration and incorporation. The history of educational innovation is littered with ‘top-down’ curriculum and teaching method changes that are resisted and ultimately ignored, or at best gain grudging symbolic acceptance. Failure is also built into reforms that ignore the realities of local, operational conditions. Failure is underlined by the enormous influence of passive resistance that teachers at all levels have developed to the level of an art form and can now be used as an industrial strategy for purposes beyond the resistance of new programs. These historical facts reinforce the slogan that ‘teachers matter’.

There are many implications of this discussion. We identify two themes that seem topical and relevant to the present and future directions of the Australian education system and to the purposes of this book. The first is that education reform attempts must be based necessarily on ‘syndication’. By this we mean that all parties to a proposed reform movement need to have a role in designing, implementing and managing the program.

---

1 For example, in schools, ‘gifted’ students, new mathematics, compensatory education for the ‘disadvantaged’, ethnic studies, project teaching, bilingual education, open classrooms, inquiry learning, team teaching, student rights, objectives management, alternative schools…
We define this preferred arrangement as a strategic alliance with the producers, orchestrators, brokers, disseminators and users in teacher education—what used to be called collaboration or even partnerships (Smith and Lynch, 2010). There is nothing really new in calling for the co-creation of programs in a community of practice to reflect contemporary society but actually doing it in education would be very new.

Teachers play a key role in syndicated organisations that make available relevant services, resources, capacities and content to other players “in the game” to use for agreed ends and mutual benefit. It goes some way in breaking down the barriers of “us” and “them” within and between the silos in the education institution such as schooling, VET, higher education and the myriad of sub-empires within each and reflected in the organisation of such things as government departments.

The second theme follows from the lack of robust knowledge about teaching and how classrooms at all levels operate. In 1998 Marzano reminds readers that an “educator trying to make sense about what research has to say about instruction is faced with a daunting task” (Marzano, 1998, P.1). Despite accumulating research evidence from systematic studies of instruction and classroom dynamics connected to student learning outcomes (See for example: Hattie, et al 1996; Hattie, 1992; Palincscar and Brown 1985; Lysakowski and Walberg, 1982), the sheer size and variety of the data-base dealing with “instruction” and the lack of coherent summaries of the corpus dogged the teaching profession until quite recently.

The difficulty in synthesizing them lay in the methodological approach available then that relied on the reviewer interpreting what numerous available studies seemed to be saying. Apart from the obvious difficulties of identifying and classifying studies for analysis and determining their methodological validity, this “narrative” method is susceptible to error as later computer assisted “meta” analyses showed (Glass, et al, 1998): reviewers were bound to over-estimate the effects on student learning of some studies and to under-estimate the effects of others.
Moreover, because education research is subject to the ideological forces of the day, some meanings attributable to research findings are preferred by social and political gatekeepers (Grossen, 1995-6). In this respect, from our perspective, student-centred teaching approaches and an emphasis on “curriculum” rather than “teaching” have characterised Australian education policy and practice for at least five decades, regardless of contrary research (see for example Kirschner, et al, 2006).

With all of the dangers of being over-enthusiastic and being captured by the ideological colour of the present education countryside, our view is that there is an emergent research-based knowledge-base that provides teachers and the teaching profession with the tools to make considered decisions (Hattie, 2009; Marzano, 2003). The accumulating research about student outcomes shows that institutions and teachers can and do have an effect, that what educational leaders and teachers do have effects on student achievement, that active, involved and interventionist teachers and teaching are more likely to have positive effects on student achievement than other kinds of teaching approaches and that effective teaching strategies can be named and taught.

Moreover, the research on effective teaching has a remarkable generality: the results apply to all age groups, all curriculum areas, most teachers, and broad and narrow outcomes (Hattie, 2009). Again, with all of the dangers of over-generalising, we are optimistic about the proposition that there is now a more or less robust cache of teaching knowledge and skill that a mature profession and informed policy generating sources should incorporate into their practices and discourses. As Mazano argues, “(e)ffective teaching begins with effective teacher preparation” and efforts to improve teaching should focus on “strong content expertise” and “research-based instructional strategies” (Miller, 200)\(^2\). The question is how can this be done, given the history of failed promises in education reform.

In order to grapple with that fundamental question, we now turn to the contributions in this collection. The thirteen chapters that follow fall into two distinct groups: case studies of representative core issues and recurring problems in the present system (Chapters Two through
Six). Chapters Seven through Twelve are illustrative of attempts to reform the system of education, including both conceptual schemes and case studies of actual innovations. They embody many of the elements discussed in the preceding six chapters, where people, working in educational settings, strive to modernise the system according to perceived demands and challenges of rapid social change.

Core issues and recurring problems

Lew Brennan’s chapter places the work of educational institutions into a regional context. Brennan’s background as an elected local government representative interested in driving a local economy according to knowledge age principles, provides an important lens for education policy and operation. In particular, he makes a strong case for partnerships and the solving of ‘knowing-doing’ gaps that seem to characterise educational provision for ‘the advancement of regions’ but do not engage with the ‘how’ issues. Governments, institutions, agents, networks and actors who wish to collaborate to improve regional areas are left foundering, despite their goodwill.

Brennan has confidence in the capacity of knowledge and skill to drive regional economies in sustainable, productive and socially just ways. It is crucial then that universities and schools are harnessed to regional needs and interests while attending to global developments. He is particularly interested in technology-based educational means that provide the platform for “wisdom, creativity, productivity, further learning, prosperity, socio economic capacity, a balanced demographic, and ideally advancements toward the ultimate goals of regional self-reliance and peace and permanence”.

Larry Smith argues that universities have been captured by what he refers to as the ‘new managerialism’. The claim is that universities and indeed the other sectors of the education system have become market-driven businesses rather than student-driven sites for intellectual enrichment. This forced dichotomy of ‘market-driven’ and ‘student centred’ or intellectually driven is a common element in the critique of contemporary education. The current arrangements for the management and governance of education are said to be market driven because the present model imposes definite constraints and
restrictions on educational institutions facing rapid social change, globalised competition, increasingly diverse student cohorts, and new challenges and demands from governments and communities. An emphasis on outcomes rather than inputs, demonstrable performances, controlling costs, monitoring the operations of institutional parts and the emergence of “groupthink” are said to characterise the market model. Critiques of these elements tend to champion decision-making by committees of practitioners, intellectual goals, individualised approaches to curriculum development and pedagogical approaches, multiple acceptable outcomes and the primacy of discipline expertise over management and governance processes.

A core issue in the evolution of this model at all levels in the education system then is the clash of two cultures: a management culture and an academic culture. The former is conventionally seen as being in conflict with traditional academic cultural values about open debate and academic freedom. The assumption seems to be that in a past era, open debate and academic freedom characterised educational systems especially universities. The schism between ‘managers’ and ‘academics’ can lead to disaffection amongst teaching and research staff when their interests appear to be over-ruled by the managerial model and externally imposed goals.

The hierarchical and seemingly absolute demarcation of roles between administrative staff, teacher practitioners and academics is clearly described by Jeanne Allen. Her experience of moving from the school sector into a university was fraught with ambiguity and frustration. The university was still very much in the pre-managerialist era when Allen joined the staff and she expected to find the open debate and academic freedom in the romantic view of the scholarly values. The reality was somewhat different, prompting Allen to ask:

Where was the free-thinking, the free speech, the robust debate I had always associated with the academy? Where was the abundance of ideas – of original thought even – that is surely synonymous with our highest educational institutions? For the most part, in this university at this point in time, these were silenced.

The more traditional academic culture for Allen was just another case of ‘groupthink’ where people protected their ground and interests.
Mark Sinclair chronicles his journey from radical student to both critic of attempts to reform education either at the school or university levels and as a proponent of stronger governance within the university sector. He is particularly intent on revealing the system inefficiencies within and between universities that are shielded by academic culture and, in the present circumstances, by managerialist processes. Sinclair reveals the exclusivity, inflexibility, short-sightedness and lack of application criteria of ‘academic’ culture when faced with social issues. He also shows how reform efforts are bound to account for the ‘groupthink’ effects of academic culture that champion self-interest above those of interested constituencies beyond the institution.

Li Xuan’s chapter provides an insight into these dimensions of academic life. On the one hand, from the perspective of a part-time lecturer in her Australian university case study, managerialism reigns supreme. On the other hand, Li shows how the “system” can exploit teaching staff by marginalising them from the mainstream of academic life defined by academic values. As Li points out, the sessional staff take on a large teaching role that sustains the institution at minimal cost yet are categorised and treated as outsiders, as hired help, in comparison with full-time academic staff engaged in teaching and research.

These chapters show clearly that ‘reform’ of the education system is difficult to categorise as ‘managerial’ or ‘traditional’. Both approaches in their pure forms either co-produce vigorous opposition from the education workforce and exclusion of social impact respectively.

Lynch and Smith provide an historical account of an innovation in teacher education. They show how a social analysis of contemporary social conditions implied a new kind of content and process for a pre-service teacher education program. The new program was evaluated and studied by an independent national research organisation and two doctoral studies. The evaluation indicated that the new program exemplified a core model of effective pedagogy and its application; linkages between theory and practice; partnership between schools, employing authorities and the university; and a standards-based curriculum.
However, the two doctoral studies indicated ‘slippages’ between the new program and practices in the university and in schools. Indeed, the very elements lauded by the evaluation as being the drivers of a successful pre-service teacher preparation are paradoxically the ones perhaps most likely to generate resistance in university Schools of Education and in schools. University and school ‘groupthink’ maintained the status quo illustrating why it is difficult to change the practices of education institutions. Lynch and Smith conclude with what some observers would label as ‘managerialism’, namely that if governments, universities or school systems want to intervene on behalf of productive outcomes in teacher education then the whole operation should be syndicated.

Jake Madden describes how his school went about ‘school improvement’ in and for the 21st century. His case study points out that “nothing changes if nothing changes” and “if we keep doing what we’ve always done, we’ll only get what we’ve always got” thus putting his principalship in potential conflict with the prevailing organisational culture. Madden underlines the importance of making culture changes as a prelude to the planning of new pedagogies and other school improvement processes, along with strong community relationships and the use of research-based theoretical approaches.

The fundamental question of “what is it that school leaders can do that help teachers make the biggest difference for students in their class?” introduces David Turner’s chapter. He proposes that there is a gap between ‘knowing’ and applying that knowledge in organisations including the educational set. Moreover, the knowing-doing gap is not just a policy problem but applies equally to school leadership. School leaders often know what is important but their knowledge is not reflected in their behaviour.

Turner’s list of behaviours that block ‘doing’ can be easily translated into the conditions reported by Smith, Sinclair, Allen, Li, Lynch and Smith and Madden. They all block or conceal the need for intentional action. Turner concludes that school leadership needs to prioritise what the research on successful teaching says, ensuring that teachers know what the research says and focusing relentlessly on creating the conditions that ensure knowing becomes doing.
Reform proposals

Ken Sell, Candice Grimstad and Scott Williams present a model that is particularly aimed at transforming a Norwegian international school from the perspective of the school principal and a special form of accountability. Like others in the collection, Sell, Grimstead and Williams are struggling to find ways of adapting the traditional school and its underpinnings to raise student achievement in the Knowledge Society. In this sense, the Norwegian case is an example of the more general search for the modern education institution.

Like others in the field, the authors develop a reform framework that implies intervention strategies aimed at professional culture and the performance of different parts of the school. They judge the effectiveness of the intervention strategies for teachers and the school according to the framework content. The chapter concludes with a number of queries about school reform that includes perhaps the most important of all given Turner’s work, namely: “To what extent has the school’s collective capacity really improved as a result of the changes the school has made?”

The preparation of teachers is internationally mentioned as a core education reform initiative that has spin-offs into all education sectors and across national socio-economic goals. Gunnar Grut, Tine Arntzen Hestbek and Inger Langseth describe how a fast approaching generation turn-over of Norwegian teachers, a national evaluation of primary school teacher education and that the magnitude of public education investment is not justified by national and international test results. They argue that the traditional Norwegian school and teacher education systems can be compared to a kangaroo: jumping along without direction.

These authors pinpoint one of the most enduring, intractable problems in teacher education: the fact that students often see the university as predominantly theory-based and the practise field as predominantly practise-based. They mount a detailed discussion about how this universal dilemma can be solved.

This collection then can be read as separate pieces about regional development, schools, or universities or teacher education. It can also
be appreciated as a more general discussion and analysis of legacy issues in a system of education struggles to find its way in a period of rapid social change. The release of the 2011 Census data confirms the speed of change in Australia since the last census and underscores the need for definite systematic change in education institutions at different levels and for a system that is fine-tuned to these changes.

Reference List


Chapter 2: The Value of Regional Universities in the Knowledge Age

Lew Brennan

Knowledge economy, knowledge society, and the knowledge age are well worn clichés that have developed to explain the phenomena where by society and the economy are progressed largely by the production and use of knowledge to create new products and services. (Bell, 1973; OECD, 1996; Donkin, 1998; Nowotny, 2008) Globalisation is one of the outcomes of the advances in knowledge production and the sharing of knowledge in the new technology race era, however questions are being asked and some confusion is growing in regard to new roles for universities and government, society and industry in this rapidly changing landscape (Lundvall, 2006). Further consideration of how this phenomenon plays out in a micro context is vital for the future development and prosperity of regions. Indeed it seems that it is quite acceptable amongst macro-economists to assume that what happens at the macro-economic level can be well understood and successfully transferred to the micro-delivery level without fully considering the relationships between technology and the institutions committed to innovation learning and the broader implications around social capital and the economy.

Before focusing on such considerations it is important to clarify, or at least consider, further the values of this phenomenon of knowledge in the modern technological world and the impact on society. Simply promoting ‘the advancement of regions’ does not direct us on the manner of the advancement and leaves little in the way of definitive direction for governments, institutions, agents, networks and actors participating within the society. At least knowledge is widely considered to be a public good and something to be supported and promoted, although theories and arguments on who is responsible for the management of knowledge and the divisions of knowledge abound, particularly as issues concerning knowledge are shifting from traditional specialized science policy to the centre stage of the modern politics of competitiveness in a globalized marketplace (Sorbin and Vessuri, 2006). Not only is the free market driving outcomes from
knowledge in non-traditional methods of research, knowledge itself is now being considered in a completely different perspective globally by societies made up of technological networks and new media. In this paper I aim to explore these elements of a modern knowledge based society and the value of knowledge to the economy specifically in a regional context and consider the values of the university and its role in this regional context. This chapter comes from a non-academic perspective and explores the value of regional universities and other considerations from the role of an actor in regional socio-economic development activity.

**Meta Civica**

“Given the speed of change, governments and businesses throughout the world recognize that education and training are the keys to the future, and they emphasise the vital need to develop powers of creativity and innovation” (Robinson, 1999).

To further the advancement of society and in particular those societies contained within regional catchments, it has been shown that the imperative element of success is higher education, and further that multipliers are applied when the knowledge generated is aligned with the regional vision and takes full consideration of regional needs, resources, assets and societal challenges. The product of this circumstance I have identified as Meta Civica, a state of higher order society in a qualitative progressive sense (Brennan, 2005).

It could be argued that knowledge societies have been around since homo-erectus began huddling in groups. The ability to develop survival skills depended on sharing knowledge and more importantly it has been shown that the ability to adapt to changing circumstances has separated us from other animals and advanced our race. It is quite sobering to consider that the first illustrations by man on the Lascaux Caves in France were made by marking stone with stone, not dissimilar to my first lessons in primary school where we used slate and stone as our writing tools, which doesn’t say much on the issue of adaptability over many thousands of years. However there is no less importance today on the ability to adapt to change, and the key to that adaptability is education and innovation.
To suggest that the knowledge age began with modern technology is to dismiss the great civilizations and great periods of advancement in history, however the term Knowledge Economy attempts to focus on the phenomena whereby knowledge makes up a significant, if not the majority of the economic fabric of a knowledge society. There is no better example than the region of Emilia-Romagna in Northern Italy that has generally and consistently outperformed all of Europe, despite not having valuable raw materials for traditional production.

As Putnam’s (2000) study on Italy highlighted, the success of this region, centred in Bologna, came from the establishment of the first university in Europe in the 11th century. In the years that followed the opening of this highly respected institution over 4000 of the greatest minds in the known world moved to Bologna to study, laying a foundation for a knowledge based economy that still prospers today, and delivers an economic output through a relationship with over 8,000 business co-operatives.

The output from higher education has been innovation and invention and from this came the ongoing organic ability for this region to constantly adapt to change. History is littered with great societies that have been educated and have even controlled the known world and yet as with the Egyptians and Romans and Russians and British, they have collapsed. Clearly then the outcome of education is to be knowledge, and as Schumacher proposed, the outcome of knowledge is to be wisdom, the application of which is the point of conversion of education into innovation and creativity, adaptability and the achievement of Meta Civica in a sustainable sense. Or as H G Wells (1920) put it “Civilization is a race between education and catastrophe.”

Robinson directed us to the three main roles of universities within society, 1. Personal, that is to develop individual talents and sensibilities. 2. Cultural, to deepen understanding of the world. 3. Economic, to provide the skills required to earn a living and to be economically productive. I would add another role to this list, an outcome of all three elements, 4. Adaptation, the ability for society to adapt to global societal, economic and environmental change. He also sees it as essential to promote them equally and in relation to each other, and that the key to transforming the education system into a 21st Century process is an understanding of how they interconnect.
And yet commentator after commentator recognizes that in many ways universities and policy are failing us on these simple roles, and even more so in regions. (Chatterton and Goddard, 2000, Goddard and Vallance, 2011, Robinson, 1999) Further complicating the situation today and distracting many from these core roles is the decline of modern socio economic structures globally, more so than at any other time in the modern world since the Great Depression. Therefore it is essential to not only review the value of universities and higher education in the knowledge age, but also to define the purpose and relevance of education within the age of constant rapid change.

The Natural Advantage to Regions

“We have got to get this absolutely right; the issue is not technology, but what it means to be human, what kind of future we want for the human race” (Abbott, 1997).

Regional universities make an unquestionable and invaluable contribution to the regions they are embedded in, and much research has been done to define those benefits in real terms. From the number of students that remain in regions and contribute to the social capital, to the economic drivers of increased productivity that spill from greater capacity in the workforce, to multipliers of federal investment in universities in regions that flow into associated and non-associated sectors of society, and of course the innovation and business creation that comes from research.

It seems that everyone from Alan Greenspan to the local council now ‘gets it’, that social capital, productivity growth, employment, and long term participation all come from an investment in education, and these outcomes are a product of creativity and innovation. However compartmentalizing the benefits may very well distract us from the big picture, or the real game and one that has been the challenge for all societies throughout time. As Shumacher (1973) put it, the purpose of knowledge is wisdom and the central concept of wisdom is permanence, (or as the modern world describes it, sustainability) and the achievement of ‘Peace and Permanence’.

“We often hear it said that we are entering the era of ‘the Learning Society’! Let us hope this is true. We still have to learn how to live
peacefully, not only with our fellow men but also with nature and above all those Higher Powers which have made nature and have made us.” (Schumacher, 1973, p. 21).

Peace and Permanence is Schumacher’s (1973, p. 21) global version of a regional Meta Civica, so what does that imply on universities? In the pursuit of Peace and Permanence he saw that:

Wisdom demands a new orientation of science and technology towards the organic, the gentle, the non-violent, the elegant and beautiful ” and the requisite of scientists and technologists is to develop methods and equipment that is ‘cheap enough so that it is accessible to virtually everyone, suitable for small scale application, and compatible for man’s need for creativity.

Indeed contained within this proposal is the natural advantage to regions. Previously restricted by lack of opportunity through limited access to raw materials, large scale manufacturing, ports and transport infrastructure and government attention within the political realm of centralised Federal and State Government policies, regions are now primed to advance along Schumacher’s vision which is unfolding rapidly courtesy of advancements in technology that actualize those requisites, without the burden of having to turn traditional political and corporate attention away from existing big business.

In this rapidly changing landscape technology is the single most important and effective tool to deliver the science and innovation in an accessible form, suitable to small scale application which provides the platform for wisdom, creativity, productivity, further learning, prosperity, socio economic capacity, a balanced demographic, and ideally advancements toward the ultimate goals of regional self-reliance and peace and permanence.

The Emilia-Romagna model in Northern Italy is worth considering. The Bologna university has a relationship with thousands of co-operative companies producing some of the highest order goods and finest foods in Europe, if not the world, without local raw materials. This model has key advantages for more people and contributes to a more humanly satisfying life.

In regions there are significant numbers of the population desperate for the type of support described by Huxley and Schumacher and
In the example of the Sunshine Coast Region in Queensland Australia, more than 60% of all business is home-based micro scaled business. It has an area of 3,500 square kilometres and a population of 330,000 people and is the fastest growing region in Australia, expected to reach a population of half million within fifty years. Comparatively it is equal in size and population to the 177th largest country in the world. With a current Gross Regional Product of $10 B it is the 141st largest country in the world.

It has no large-scale manufacturing and no significant raw materials, and yet it is primed to be a future global competitor because of the opportunities provided by technology and education. The challenge for this region, as with many others in Australia and internationally, is to have Federal and State Government policy and funding aligned with a decentralized commitment to higher education and technologies that are equally comparable to not only Australian cities and their heavily funded historically mature universities, but also international universities, research centre’s and technologies. Current statistics are disturbing.

There are no regional universities in Australia ranked within the top 200 universities in the ‘4 International Colleges and Universities 2011 World University Web Ranking’ list, nor the ‘Times Higher Education World University Rankings 2011-12. Wollongong University is the only Australian regional university to make the top 20 universities in Australia, and only managed to be placed 45th in Asia. As Greenwood (2007), Longley (2005) and others have bravely pointed out, significant actual change in policymaking needs to be made before regional universities can truly be the catalyst for regional cultural development and socio-economic health and wellbeing.

Despite these circumstances and challenges Greenwood also points out that there examples of universities that serve their regions and localities well, and have gained much from these relationships, however the conditions by which this can develop require significant overall institutional change before public universities become important contributors universally. Indeed much reform seems focused on the safe haven of traditionalism in higher education, despite the rhetoric contained within policy and prospectuses. (Greenwood, 2007; Longley, 2005; Erlich, 2000)
Regional Universities themselves have a challenge in recognising both their local and their international position and along with this, identifying the partnerships and forms of engagement required regionally which will advance the relationship with the community and the private corporate and business sector to identify shared visions and directions and adopt coursework that supports these directions.

The OECD (2007) has argued that reuniting regions with their universities requires a better understanding of the drivers and barriers to engagement and other commentators are reflecting on the broadening of thinking around more multi-faceted frameworks that embrace dimensions such as social equity and cohesion, democratic participation environmental and economic sustainability as well as prosperity. (Morgan, 1997; Moulart and Nussbaumer, 2005; Pike 2007; Hudson, 2010; Goddard and Puukka, 2008)

Greenwood identifies ‘problem owners’ in relation to the issues of regional university relevance and engagement. Among the ‘economic problem owners’ he sees are those internal to the university, including students, staff, faculty and administrators. External ‘problem owners’ include the providers of goods and services, construction contractors, lawyers and notaries, national overseers including education ministries and accounting.

Also private sector and public sector consumers of students of graduates and research and taxpayers get a mention. The ‘Social problem owners’ include citizens and independent students and their families, local and regional communities affected by the university presence. Greenwood (2007) goes on to dissect the issues associated with these problem owners and pays particular attention to the academic and administrative interpretation of ‘what is best for the student’ and for the university, and from there goes to some length to point out that little in the political economy of public universities directly obligates them to their regional environment.

Specific regional benefits of becoming ‘at one with the region’ have been discussed at length (Longley, 2005; Schuller, 2006; Brennan, 2005) however the concept of advancements in regional self-reliance through these partnerships leading to a global maturity and
competitiveness need to be considered more fully. Indeed the ultimate outcome from the shared innovation, creativity, knowledge and wisdom is an identifiable regional culture and ultimately socio-economic evolution.

“We’re from the university and we’re here to help.”

“I used to be an academic, it is another form of life” (Robinson, 1999).

If the evidence is so overwhelming in regard to the value of regional universities to regions, the questions I ask myself regularly is “why is it so hard to advance the development of these institutions?” Whilst most academics recognize the value of partnerships between higher education institutions, “why are universities so territorial?” The value of research from universities is well defined however “why do universities and education policy still grapple with the role of the university in a commercial partnership, or indeed the commercialization of innovation within the university itself”. Ten years ago I had the great pleasure of working with a few friends to create what was then the first faculty of higher education in the Noosa region. It came about through a shared vision from three separate actors with three separate perspectives.

From my perspective I wanted a socio-economic engine for a region with a fragile tourist based economy that was losing large numbers of its young people to the cities for education and for work. From Professor David Lynch’s perspective he wanted to roll out a brand new education degree that he had written with his partner Professor Richard Smith.

The degree was the Bachelor of Learning Management (BLM) and it was a replacement for the Bachelor of Education that had been the mainstay of teaching in Australia for generations. The third player was Peter Bradford, a visionary principle of the newly built Pomona High School. Peter saw the need for opportunities for his graduating students and he saw an opportunity to provide a facility to start the first campus of a university. Ten years later we can reflect on the successes from all perspectives.
The Noosa Campus of C Q University is not only alive and well but is thriving and has planned growth to 6,000 students over the next ten years. Young people in the region have a choice and many are taking the local option from a range of regionally relevant courses. The number of young people in the Noosa region has grown considerably, from making up only 7% of the population prior to the campus opening to now make up 12% of the population. To say that this journey is rewarding is an understatement. To say it was easy is an untruth. From a political perspective it required ‘negotiations’ with both the State and Federal Government, the university leaders and university board, the local government and as the campus developed the private property and development sector, just to enter into a ‘trial’ phase. The key performance indicator was a Federal Government sponsored independent review of the quality of the program, which as it turns out identified the BLM as the most effective education degree in Australia today (Ingvarsen et al, 2005).

The purpose of this history lesson is to point out the complexities of developing a regional higher education institution at a time when it seems every ‘man and their dog’ understands the essential nature of these outcomes to regions in the rapidly advancing global knowledge age. The greater challenge follows, and that is to have the institutions engage within the region in a productive and meaningful way, align coursework and research with the regional vision and ultimately support the region in its globalized positioning.

As Mala Singh puts it,

The idea of a socially engaged university belongs in a long line of moves to assign or appropriate the university for socially preferred purposes. Modernisation, national (regional) development and nation (region) building, manpower and human capital development, democratization and social transformation and economic growth and competitiveness have been among the imperatives that have underpinned the arguments for the university to transcend it’s inwardly defined core functions of teaching, learning, and service and become more socially embedded (Singh, 2006, p. 53).

The role of the academic has not traditionally required them to commit to reconceptualising not only the mission, values and functions of the university but also its familiar institutional forms and systemic locations and most importantly, its relationship with an
enlarged number of external constituencies. Singh (2006) recognizes the difficulties of the task ahead and sees the only notion of engagement that is achievable and makes sense is a multidimensional strategy whose internal tensions and often unpredictable consequences require adroit steering and constant negotiation.

In other words the single most important facet of reconstructed institutions in their response to the impact of globalization on regions is adaptability, and the development of brave new institutions and academics who choose opportunism and dynamism as their curriculum. As Singh points out, the university is not the only player, but clearly is at the core of these imperatives, however to many ‘outsiders’ the grassy grove of Aristotle’s academia looks more like a murky lake and academics appear to be funny fish indeed.

To assist in the process of actualizing engagement strategies the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU) has initiated a ‘Framework for Engagement,’ a worldwide debate among some five hundred member universities on the issue of university engagement. This is a powerful reaffirmation of the broad social purposes of higher education in a context where narrow economic purposes are imposing their dominance. It is a call to universities to take on the accountability imperative proactively and pre-emptively, and move the debate about the future of higher education beyond defences of failing models or critiques of developments in higher education that offer no feasible alternatives (Coldstream and Bjarnason, 2003; Singh 2006).

The document lays out a clear direction for all players and also recognizes that no mature institution is starting from a clean slate, or rather…a clean computer. It implies strenuous, thoughtful, argumentative interaction with the non-university world in at least four spheres, ‘setting universities aims, purposes and priorities; relating teaching and learning to the wider world; the back and forth dialogue between researchers and practitioners; and taking on wider responsibilities as neighbours and citizens.’ The Consultation Document makes it painfully clear that applied knowledge, high-level skills for social and economic development, and constant responsiveness to societal needs and requests for new programs and services are now required of universities. Indeed it sees engagement as the raison d’être of the university.
If that is to be the case there is certainly a requirement for academics and researchers to review their roles and activities in their march towards relevance and civic engagement. The delivery of traditional education alone eliminates their responsibility to the institution to actively engage in meaningful partnerships with society as is now required. In the paradigm of a university as a communicative and interactive space for and with multiple stakeholders, one has to ensure that their role is not confined to being only the technically expert interpreters of the needs of other stakeholders (Delanty, 2001; Singh, 2006).

Obviously, the other stakeholders in regional engagement have as much to do in the way of understanding the engagement partnership, its benefits and its potential, however this is a complex and separate consideration to this paper, and to some extent their commitment will be driven by policy at the political level, and profits at the commercial level, all of which will formulate the financial strategies of universities as they commit or are required to commit to the principles of socio-economic development through this engagement initiative.

In line with this requirement, virtually every country in the world is moving to make university and industry links a core part of their innovations systems, and the notion of a triple helix representing the relationship between governments, universities and the business community has wide spread application (Etzkowitz, 2002; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorf, 1997). Having said that it is worth reflecting on the situation where there are currently many conversations underway in regard to how universities will behave as partners in the commercial world and how they will fund the expansive role of universities in the knowledge age whilst maintaining their integrity as researchers.

Historically universities have provided little in the way of patenting, licensing and commercialization, however there is a massive change in attitude and policy underway in developing countries like China and India where national innovation policy and systems have been constructed embracing technology as the key to development, and with it the utility of research oriented universities as a means of augmenting the innovation capability of the economy. This change in direction towards applied research is not unlike the redirection of American universities during the Second World War.
The extension of that scenario is the consideration of accessibility to the engaging university. Barnett (2003) claims that the corporate sector will have greater leveraging power over others in their vigorous approach to engagement with research, and that the universities will be persuaded to structure themselves in favour of activities likely to have ‘exchange value’ in the knowledge economy. He goes on to state that through this approach there is hardly likely to be a level playing field in stakeholder power and influence (Barnett, 2003). However to do so is to dismiss the single most essential element of all, and that is technology as not only a vital tool of the knowledge economy, innovation and development, but also as the great leveller of the playing fields of engagement.

The rules of engagement …there are no rules.

As we have seen it is essential to the advancement of emerging regional knowledge based societies that academic productivity and research prospers in order to realize regional visions and prosperity, and ultimately a preferred culture. The transfer of this knowledge to the ‘real world’ is through bridging and bonding initiatives exercised by numerous actors within and external to the region, and as societies come to the realization that there are other sources of knowledge than the traditional research institute and higher education institutions (murky lakes full of funny fish), universities are now under considerable pressure to fully explore the opportunities contained within advancements in technology for the express purpose of meaningful engagement.

Not to do so will not only restrict the ability to partner with society, but may well mean the death of the regional institution in the very competitive world of the education industry. In the age of ‘Creative Capitalism’ the university has become a critical component in the provision of ‘Talent, Knowledge and Innovation’ (Florida, 2005). Considering the limited outputs from the licensing and commercialization of research, the main product of universities is still knowledgeable, innovative and talented people who can apply themselves to societal needs and futures considerations.

The engaged regional university’s multi-faceted role in delivering these elements can according to Chatterton and Goddard (2000) be
encapsulated in a single priority, ‘meeting the needs of a more diverse client population.’ Among these needs they recognize relatively new demands including flexible structures for lifelong learning, created by rapidly changing skill demands; more locally based education as public maintenance support for students decline; greater links between research and industry; and more engagement with the end users of research.

In a knowledge based creative capitalist society, technology is not only the tool that transfers the knowledge to the end user, it is the product and service ‘of’ the end user in what has been described as a ‘learning economy’ or ‘learning region’ (Lundvall and Johnson, 1994).

The learning economy and learning society are recognized by the success of individuals, firms and regions reflects the capability to learn, where change is rapid and old skills become obsolete, and where learning includes the building of competencies rather than just access to information, where learning is going on in all parts of society and job creation is in the knowledge intensive sectors. Again there is a natural advantage for regions as Chatterton and Goddard point out, network knowledge is highly dependent on interpersonal relations and therefore be developed most readily within a particular region.

They further recognize that the link between learning regions, the information society and information communication technologies is mutually beneficial and self-reinforcing. As forward looking as this research was in 2000 it hardly prepared society and leaders of society for the speed of change in this direction, leading us into what is now being described as the next phenomena, the ‘virtual economy’ and the ‘virtual society.’

Regional universities somehow need to take stock of the next game, and take advantage of it for the advancement not only of the institution but the region itself. The next game is a technologically based virtual learning and governing society, that is if we are to believe the statistics and trends going on already today, and it is hard not to.
Social advancement is going to be generated from social media. The globalization of regions becomes a reality immediately within virtual and new media communities. Social media is now shifting societies and economies more seismically than the industrial revolution, and is driving a fundamental shift in the way we communicate.

Clearly this needs to be a major consideration when progressing the transfer of knowledge from universities to society. It took radio 38 years to attract 50 million viewers, television 13 years, the Internet 4 years and the iPod 3 years. Facebook had 200 million users in 12 months. If Facebook was a country it would be the third largest country in the world. Facebook surpasses Google for traffic in the United States and 50% of all mobile Internet traffic in the United Kingdom is for Facebook. A U.S. Department of Education study revealed that online students outperformed those receiving face-to-face instruction. Eighty percent of U.S. companies use social media such as Linked-in to recruit staff.

When it comes to lifelong learning in learning societies it is interesting to see the fastest growing segment of users of Facebook is women aged from 55 to 65 years old. Wikipedia has over 15 million articles and studies show that it is as accurate as Encyclopedia Britannica, and 78% of these articles are non-English.

There are over 200 million blogs and 78% of consumers trust peer reviews posted on blogs, whilst only 14% trust traditional advertisements. Some universities have stopped distributing e-mail accounts and are using e-Readers, iPads and Tablets. (Social Media Revolution. YouTube)

Social media is now a fundamental system of communication and sociologists and socio economists are struggling to keep up with the advancement of social networks during this period of unprecedented change. Research in to other systems such as mathematical, biological and metabolist, are being carried out in an effort to get a greater understanding of the relevance of these changes in society.

Hollingsworth and Muller (2008) argue that these systems are ushering in a new scientific epistemology. More recently studies into gene networks have progressed, fundamentally because these
networks do not act directly and physically with each other, but more abstractly and in line with social network activities (Greenspan, 2008).

Edelman proposes that social networks are mediated by language and are therefore inescapably abstract, and further that the requirement for physical interaction may have been a limitation at previous times in history, but now that we have the vast expansive and interconnected virtual world such limitations on society are no longer relevant.

Nowotny (2008) reflects on basic human selection processes and observes that the scientific attractiveness of issues and problems is based on their ‘technological sweetness’ or sexiness, and this is linked to the wish to know. There can be no better issue to focus on than the development of society and what could possibly be of more value to a region than an institution that progresses these studies in the form of interdisciplinary networks, merging socio-economics with new theories on epistemology.

McGonigal (2011) introduces the proposition that the future of engagement, learning and governance is embedded in the electronic gaming phenomena. Her studies show that the skills most admired and most effective in the gaming community are the same skills required in real world problem solving and real world development. These skills include establishing clear goals, optimism and enthusiasm, extraordinary focus, social sharing and borrowing, constant feedback that is subjective rather than objective and is constructive by nature. McGonigal describes the real possibility of converting the fantasy and unreal gaming world into real world challenges that have a technological sweetness to millions of participants worldwide who have the desired skills to achieve real outcomes through mass cooperation.

As an indication of the resource available today, there are currently 3 billion hours of gaming played online per week, and the average person born today will spend 10,000 hours playing online games by the time they reach twenty one. This co-incidently equates to the amount of time they are currently expected to put to education until high school graduation.
In ten years from now there will be 1.5 billion computer gamers worldwide who according to McGonigal carry the skills of mass collaboration, cognitive energy, ‘urgent optimism,’ extraordinary focus, no fear of failure, an understanding of clear goals, social sharing and borrowing, constant subjective and constructive feedback, use of real time information and who make up a society that has the second largest population in the world, and who could be challenged with the advancement of society.

A society where there are no physical boundaries other than technological, is accessible, is adaptable, and one where the social fabric is developed through trust and has stronger social networks than any community on the planet. McGonigal describes a society as comprised of super empowered hopeful individuals who focus on issues of a global scale. Gaming economies are already entering real world economies whereby trading and auctions of game world assets are being paid for with real world currencies.

When one considers that game world economies are worth billions of dollars, (in 2001 ‘Everquest’s Gross National product was determined at $2,266 USD per capita which makes it comparable to the Russia or Bulgarian economy) it is not unreasonable to see the transfer of economic skills from game to real, particularly as research shows that these games are not only inhabited by geeks, but by CEO’s academics, housewives and the general populace. Business leaders, politicians and educators are paying attention to the possibilities offered by these spaces to reach a new generation of student, constituent and leader.

The million dollar question is ‘what value is the regional university within this extraordinary technological and societal change?’

**Conclusion**

Regional universities are in an unprecedented position of opportunity. As regions progress from traditional economic platforms to new realms of creative economies through interaction and engagement, regions can position themselves as global competitors in the knowledge age. Regional universities are faced with extraordinary challenges around funding and policy development that keeps pace with the need for constant rapid change, however the answers to the
challenges may well be within the new realm itself. The Civic University is essential, and education and society will become inextricably linked in prosperous regions. Indeed it will become policy in many countries in the advancing world as more and more recognition is given to the importance of localized research and the outpouring of innovation, creativity and wisdom. The value of such an institution is immeasurable, and clearly not confined to simple economic considerations.

The new Alto university in Helsinki, Finland, the product of a merger of three established universities, sees their objectives and values as “To be a world class university combining art, technology and industrial design to stimulate innovation…to educate responsible and broad minded experts with a wide perspective to act as future visionaries in the society…an institution with passion to explore boundaries, freedom to be creative, courage to influence and excel, a duty to care and inspire and with high ethics, openness and equality” (Pursula, 2010).

Regional universities anywhere could do well to aspire to be such a civic university and through such a commitment make a most valuable contribution to any regional society. Such institutions would not only mobilise their research around grand challenges but also organize their teaching with a view to producing future citizens whose decisions as consumers, workers or entrepreneurs will bring about societal innovation in the broader public interest (Goddard and Valance 2011).
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Chapter 3: Leadership Constraints and Restraints Under the ‘New Managerialism’

Larry Smith

‘New Managerialism’ in the university sector refers to the increasingly pervasive use of corporate processes and practices for institutional leadership and management. The focus of ‘new managerialism’ is on efficiency, accountability and standards – generally packaged under the rhetoric of ‘quality assurance’. Under the ‘new managerialism’, business processes, practices and performance indicators override the previous dominance of learning, professional skills and knowledge in Australian universities.

Jeannie Rae (2011: p. 6), the President of the National Tertiary Education Union (NTEU) in Australia, recently commented that in Australian universities, there is now “simply no space to move, to innovate, to respond to the needs of increasingly diverse student cohorts, or to meet the community’s demands for research and engagement” (2011: p. 6). Rae goes on to say that “many accuse senior managers of not listening to informed advice or criticism, of micromanaging and measuring everything. Staff feel under constant critical scrutiny and ... despite the rhetoric there is not really a whole lot of working smarter going on”.

It is reasonable to assert that there is a growing crisis of confidence in the direction and management of Australian universities. The rapid drift to corporate management and leadership practices in our higher education institutions has restrained and constrained creativity and innovative practices. Compliance is rewarded, and critical thinking is actively opposed, particularly when it challenges the decisions and directions of senior management. The ‘new managerialism’ has seen our universities become market-driven businesses rather than student-driven sites for intellectual enrichment.

This chapter explores a range of issues associated with the emerging dominance of the ‘new managerialism’ in the Australian higher education sector. It discusses the nature of university leadership and
management in this new environment, and identifies a number of the ‘symptoms’ of ‘new managerialism’ that are overtly impacting on the operation of Australian universities and, in particular, on the capacity of staff to be innovative and creative professionals. The basic theme of the chapter is that current university leadership and management practices have divided staff into two distinct groups, the ‘sycophants’ (supporters) and the ‘targets’ (critics). The ‘sycophants’ are not disposed to innovation, at least on an individual level, and the ‘targets’ are unable to leverage innovation because they have been professionally isolated from critical resources and decision-making forums.

The environment for the ‘new managerialism’ in Australian universities

In recent times, Australian universities have been subjected to a rapidly changing social, political and economic environment. Foremost among these changes have been: a politically-driven move from an elite to a mass higher education system; significantly decreased government funding of the university sector, with an increased expectation that universities will generate a substantial proportion of their own operating costs; and exposure of Australian universities to the operation of an educational market in which they are not only in competition with each other, but also with an increasing number of private institutions and overseas universities.

For at least the last two decades, Australian universities have enacted pervasive changes to their mode of operation as they have sought to respond to fundamental changes in Federal and State government higher education policy agendas and funding regimes. Increasingly, university learning and teaching has been “embedded in a corporate context, driven by market needs” (Crossman, 2005: p. 23) as governments of all persuasions have sought to promote “a more efficient and responsive system” (Sotirakou, 2004: p. 348).

In the face of significantly decreased government funding, Australian universities have had little alternative but to increase their income from commercial and entrepreneurial ventures because “without the strategies of business [for increasing revenue], universities would be experiencing a grim future in a world where western governments
generally appear to be turning their faces to the wall” (Crossman, 2005: p. 24). As Sotirakou (2004: p. 348) notes, universities have tried to compensate for the marked fall in government income through “liaisons with business and industry, through partnerships focused on innovative product development, and through the marketing of educational and business services”.

The outcome of recent government agendas, then, has been for higher education in Australia to become an educational market place in which knowledge is the primary commodity of trade. In this educational market place, the major source of funding has become international students, who are now worth more than $6 billion a year to Australian universities (Smith & Winter-Irving, 2009).

Competition among Australian universities in an educational market has been strongly supported by Australian governments because, at least from an economic viewpoint, it is seen as a way of improving performance, productivity and client services. However, a review of the literature reveals that there have been no methodologically rigorous research studies that clearly and unambiguously demonstrate that the quality of learning in Australian universities has improved in any marked way in response to the competitive environment of the higher education sector: indeed, there is a considerable bank of anecdotal evidence to suggest that the quality of learning has, in many ways and for many students, decreased.

There is also increasing evidence that competition among Australian universities has heightened the level of scrutiny among employers and tertiary students regarding the quality and useability of the outcomes from university study. If this is true, then it follows that there will be an increased focus on cutting-edge teaching, learning and research because universities need to respond “quickly and in untraditional ways to these demands” (Crossman, 2005: p. 25).

**University leadership under the ‘new managerialism’**

Since the 1990s, Australian universities have increasingly taken on a persona that is less that of a scholarly community and much more that of a business enterprise. The change, asserts Kuiper (2005, p.13), has seen universities primarily become “managed entities. Institutional
values are management values. The discourses that prevail at the institutional level are management discourses”.

This ‘new managerialism’ has seen a move in universities to a tightly integrated regime of managerial discipline and control that is markedly different from the professional environment that preceded it. This has created a conundrum, argues Kuiper (2005, p.14), because there are now “two cultures existing under the same institutional roof: the management culture and the academic culture … [and] … the two cultures frequently talk past each other and both seem barely to see the relevance of the other”. In simple terms, it is axiomatic that the public accountability and market-driven entrepreneurialism that underpin the ‘new managerialism’ are in significant conflict with traditional notions of academic culture and values, yet both are co-existing within the governing parameters and practices of contemporary Australian universities.

One of the more intriguing issues surrounding the emergence of the ‘new managerialism’ in Australian universities is that those driving the management culture in higher education are almost exclusively former academics who have gained most of their professional training and development from a system that, at the time, was antithetical to a managerial culture. Thus, suggests Kuiper (2005: p. 14), the “corporatisation of universities has been implemented from within as much as from without”.

Current university leaders must, then, be held equally culpable with politicians and industry leaders for the corporate direction of contemporary universities because they largely have been content to respond to external pressures for change, rather than be true leaders of change in their institutions and in our society generally. Indeed, university leaders have often pursued with open enthusiasm the structures and processes necessary for their universities to be more competitive and, above all, more business-like. The general trend in most Australian universities is for any opposition to the corporate agenda to be crushed quickly and often ruthlessly by institutional leaders whose current status was established on the back of an academic career built around the pursuit of open debate and academic freedom!
Universities in Australia now operate as multi-million dollar businesses with hundreds if not thousands of employees (academic and administrative staff) and tens of thousands of customers (domestic and international students, and research and consultancy clients in business and the community), yet the members of their senior management teams rarely have formal training or experience in business leadership and management. As a consequence, Australian university leaders have had to surround themselves with large numbers of experienced business professionals in order to obtain sound advice on how to run the business of the university, and on how to attain and maintain that all important business edge over their competitor universities. Nevertheless, it is the capacity to make rapid and appropriate choices in response to organisational challenges that defines the effective leader in the corporate world, and there must be significant questions raised about the extent to which most university leaders have the business experience, training and acumen to perform that role, irrespective of how many business advisors and functional staff they have employed.

In spite of all the changes in the higher education environment over the last two decades, there is an astonishing dearth of sound research into appropriate models and practices for contemporary university leadership and management. It is not surprising, then, that Australian universities have demonstrated a pervasive tendency to ‘borrow’ their organisational structures, processes and procedures from the world of business and industry. Accountability arrangements have become entrenched in clearly-defined line-management arrangements, replacing the collegial decision-making model that previously characterised universities. Standard business management tools such as strategic plans, project management, performance indicators, annual staff performance reviews, benchmarking and quality assessment systems have become the norm in university life, and have brought with them a strong focus on outputs rather than outcomes, and on procedures rather than processes (particularly the presumably core processes of teaching and learning).

Further, the success of a university primarily has come to be measured in quantitative terms, such as its number of enrolments, operating costs and net income – again, a defining characteristic of the corporate rather than the educational world. What is really interesting is that university leaders have a strong tendency to ‘sell’
their reforms to the academic staff in their own institutions by emphasising potential or actual achievements in terms of business performance criteria, not in terms of the positive impact on the quality of student learning.

**Symptoms of the ‘new managerialism’ in Australian universities**

There are many indicators of the impact of the ‘new managerialism’ on the operation of Australian universities, among the most overt of which are the following:

1. **The emergence of ‘groupthink’**

   Groupthink (Janis, 1972) is a psychological phenomenon that occurs when the desire to be part of a group and to maintain group harmony overrides rational decision-making processes. It is characterised by ‘collective optimism’ and ‘collective avoidance’ in a group (McCauley, 1998).

   Under the ‘new managerialism’, the climate of many Australian universities is increasingly conducive to groupthink. University leadership actively promotes a one-mind-set culture in which appropriate behaviour is to agree and comply with the directions of university management. One is only a ‘team player’ if one agrees, on most things at least, with the views and decisions of management. Rather than institutions in which differing perspectives are encouraged and debate is valued, the new ‘corporate’ universities place significant emphasis on developing and maintaining an illusion of unanimity among academic and administrative staff, and on the marketing of carefully scripted stereotypes to their students and communities.

   The impact of the emergence of groupthink in Australian universities is palpable and significant: an individual and collective loss of innovation, creativity, and independent thinking. It is exceeding difficult to be innovative and creative when the focus is on agreeing and complying, and when critical reflection on management decisions and university practices is actively discouraged. As the 17th Century English philosopher John Locke (1690) commented: “New opinions
are always suspected, and usually opposed, without any other reason but because they are not already common”.

2. The illusion of teams

In line with trends in the business world, the senior management of Australia’s universities strongly promote the role and importance of teamwork among university staff. Unfortunately, most of this is rhetoric, because the notion of a ‘team’ held by many university leaders is nothing more than a group of acquiescent staff who can publicly be presented as supporting the ideas and decisions of university management. University teams with the capacity to affect university strategy or policy are no longer forums for passionate debate and the airing of opposing perspectives: they generally are rigidly controlled forums, following a management-determined agenda, often comprising a carefully selected group of staff, in which discussion is polite and criticism is toned down so as not to offend. Anyone who does voice a strong criticism of the status quo is quickly labelled as “not a team player”, which somehow is seen to justify the discounting of his/her views. As Babiak and Hare (2006) suggest, contemporary university leaders are real team players, but there really is only one member of their teams.

The power of teams comes from their capacity for innovation and problem solving that is based on collaboration and open exchange of ideas (Smith & Riley, 2010). Unfortunately, as Rae (2011: p. 6) notes, effective teamwork does not operate in the modern university environment “where there is fear, and where people are constantly having their professional capability questioned, and ... where it is easy for bullies to bully and for (what should be) unacceptable behaviour to become ordinary in supervisory relations”. The inappropriate and ineffective use of teams in Australian universities can, therefore, be argued as a major inhibitor to innovation and creativity in the higher education sector.
3. Micromanaging everything

There is an old adage used by farmers about their horses: “The more you use the reins, the less they use their brains”. Clearly, Australia’s university leaders pay little attention to the traditional wisdom of our farmers, because Australian universities must now rate as among the most micromanaged organisations in the country.

Micromanagement is about the excessive supervisory involvement of university management in the professional role of academic staff. It is about asserting and maintaining control by paying extreme attention to every detail of performance. Staff are given little space to be creative, to make their own decisions, and to feel responsible for the quality of the academic processes and outcomes to which they directly contribute. As a result, Australian university academics are increasingly feeling disempowered and distrusted by university management. They are also feeling overwhelmed and stressed by the dramatic increase in the amount of paperwork university management requires them to complete on a regular basis under the guise of ‘accountability’ and ‘quality’.

Micromanagement in Australian universities may indeed be bordering on a form of bullying, because there is a mounting body of evidence to suggest that, as Manzoni and Barsoux (2002: p. 5) first reported, “if you rebel against it, you will just get more of it” – or become a target in other ways. As a result, academic staff have little option but to find the time for their huge administrative load, and that time is usually at the expense of time previously allocated for thinking creatively about scholarly issues and for conducting exploratory and innovative research.

Micromanagement is a defining indicator of a risk-averse culture, a culture in which mediocre success or even the maintenance of the status quo is considered preferable to any level of failure. Yet learning from failure is central to effective innovation – as Henry Ford reportedly said on many occasions, “failure is simply the opportunity to begin again, this time more intelligently”. Innovation must be led, and led well, yet leadership is about trusting people and giving them the encouragement and space to experiment and achieve extraordinary things. This should be the mantra of Australian universities, but sadly it is not, or at least is no longer. The focus is
not on giving people professional space – quite the opposite, it is about constraining and restraining their activities so that the risk of failure with its attendant potential for negative community perception in the educational marketplace is minimised.

4. Controlled communication and information

Francis Bacon generally is credited with the line “knowledge is power”. It appears that this is one adage that Australia’s university managers generally have read, because there is a plethora of surveys, research and professional articles asserting the selective control of communication channels in Australian universities. Despite the rhetoric of openness and transparency, systemic information generally is on a ‘need to know’ basis in that while issues of importance usually are communicated to staff, the depth of content and strategic knowledge associated with that communication generally is very superficial, and the timing of communications frequently is such that decisions have already been made or at best determined before staff receive their first information. Further, the application of the ‘commercial-in-confidence’ label is the subject of increasing usage, and serves to keep key information in the hands of a select few within the university.

Much of the information flow from management to staff occurs through committee and meeting structures or informal conversation, such that management has an additional capacity to determine who knows what and how much about what is going on inside the organisation.

Without access to timely and comprehensive information, it is difficult for staff to contribute in creative and innovative ways to the direction and performance of their university. This becomes even more problematic when the ‘upward’ flow of information and ideas is subject to even more constraints and restraints than the ‘downward’ flow. Rea (2011: p. 6) reports that in Australia’s universities, “many accuse senior managers of not listening to informed advice or criticism ... Complaints and complainants are to be ‘managed’, not resolved ... [and as a result] ... there is great wariness among university staff of speaking out”.
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Conclusion

Universities used to be, and still should be, vibrant and exciting places to work, to teach, to learn, to do research, and to engage in stimulating intellectual debate about issues of vital importance to Australian and global society. Sadly, that is no longer the case. Due in large part to the impact of ‘new managerialism’ and the dominance of an educational market, universities are now tightly controlled corporations whose success is measured in terms of student numbers and fiscal responsibility rather than according to the quality of educational processes and outcomes.

In this climate, and in spite of the rhetoric from senior management, innovation is not just difficult – it frequently is actively opposed. Increasingly, those who do not follow the corporate line, those who question whether different approaches might be more successful or appropriate, those who value processes and outcomes over procedures and outputs, become targets. They are isolated from information and decision making, and their professional credibility is brought into question in often tangential and irrelevant ways. Their opinions and ideas are initially met with a barrage of objections from management rather than an objective evaluation of potential benefits. The imperative is establishing why new or conflicting ideas should not be considered in any serious way, and why the existing direction should be maintained. The great tragedy, of course, is that it is often those predisposed to criticism who are among the most creative minds in academia. To paraphrase the international management consultant Tom Peters, successful organisations know the importance of valuing the usurpers.

In contemporary Australian universities, then, survival rather than creative endeavour has become the dominant behaviour paradigm. Sycophant behaviour is rewarded while dissenting behaviour is crushed, covertly if possible but overtly if necessary. As Rae (2011: p. 6) argues, the corporate managerial culture of Australia’s universities is one of “hierarchy, obedience and competition. It’s also one of acquiescence, of keeping your head down and getting on with it.” This is not a culture in which creativity and innovation can thrive at the level society expects of our university sector.
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Chapter 4: Why We Don’t Need an Abundance Mindset in the Management and Organisation of Higher Education

Mark Sinclair

Introduction

This chapter questions the scarcity/abundance framework and its call for more abundance and less scarcity thinking in the management and organisation of Higher Education. To begin with, the ‘connotation’ set of categories associating scarcity with fear and abundance with vision is a furphy. So are the purported closed and open mindset connotations. There is also a serious category error in the abundance organisational scheme, namely, that it disavows the profit motive and preferences results. Ironically, the global curse of Collateralised Debt Obligations (CDOs) is an example of result- rather than profit-oriented thinking entailing an abundance view of an ‘endless horizon’ of debt that someone else would eventually pay. To be sure, a good ‘result’ was achieved insofar as CDOs were sold across the planet in huge numbers. However, at the same time and entirely consistent with an abundance logic the steering wheel was eschewed, control was ceded to the herd but losses not profits materialised. Global bond markets seem to have followed a similar course too, albeit the folly is now recognised but probably too late.

Further, with reference to abundance theory’s theoretical aspirations for changing human behaviour, I do not believe that changing a ‘language of description’ (Bernstein, 1996) necessarily changes the referents of that language in the ‘real’ world. Put another way, it is at best naïve and at worst delusional to assume that problems in the real world are soluble by the application of new words to describe them (even if these words refer to actually existing open mindsets in some people’s heads). Rather, the task is to convince human beings to change their actions in a manner consistent with the behavioural precepts implicit in the schema. Moreover, my view is that abundance thinking already holds sway in universities. The task then is not to
shift the management and organisation of Higher Education any further in the direction of abundance. Instead, the point is to arrest the trend.

What follows is a series of vignettes of my personal experiences that explain this position. I leave judgements about their resemblance to ‘truth’ to the reader but I hope they cause one to pause and think. They track twenty-five years of Higher Education’s influence on my life that is in turn synthesised into some concluding and hopefully generalisable comments about the management and organisation of Higher Education. My initial window into the ‘scarcity/abundance continuum’ relates to my undergraduate days in the second half of the 1980s.

Higher Education from an undergraduate perspective circa 1986-89

At this time broadly left-wing thinking held sway in undergraduate Teacher Education and student politics, or so it seemed to me. For two years I was the President of the School of Education Students’ Association simultaneously holding the Education office within the broader Students’ Union. In the latter capacity I even reached into federal student politics, being at one time the Queensland Delegate to the Left Alliance within the National Union of Students. To give the reader a handle on the times and my view of them, in 1987 I was gobsmacked when confronted by fellow students who suggested I should be working on ways of providing services to the broad student body as opposed to organising protest rallies against the re-introduction of student fees. I couldn’t believe that it wasn’t obvious to everyone that ‘we’ should be resisting a ‘reactionary’ government ‘imposition’. The situation illustrated a typical scarcity squabble, albeit I was the one seemingly ill-distributing scarce student union fees.

When one of the Students’ Union administrative staff showed me research underpinning the government’s fee re-introduction I began to question my dogmatic faith in the endless horizon and open possibilities of free university education. That research showed that during the Whitlam-introduced ‘free university’ epoch working-class participation in university education went from two to nine per cent. Put another way, on the basis of that research taxpayers subsidised
completely the university tuition of the middle and upper classes that comprised between 91 and 98 per cent of the student body over the 15 years ‘free university’ period. Indeed I was an example. A product of The King’s School I twice failed my first year of university in 1979 and 1982 when university was free, yet went on to be accepted into an Honours programme with a Distinction average while fees were introduced. This realisation got my zero-sum mindset engaged.

My BEd degree programme further engaged it. The BEd was a ‘classical’ degree. I took ‘electives’ in subjects such as Anthropology, Archaeology and Sociology in largely ‘radical’ departments. The School of Education was in turn peopled mostly by Marxists and/or Feminists who towards the end of that decade started taking postmodernist turns. The framework under discussion is also postmodernist but at the time these academics’ ‘turns’ were novel and they, the re-introduction of student fees, the impending collapse of the ‘Eastern Bloc’ and the work of Jurgen Habermas in particular really got me thinking. In 1988 I had worked for a year on an honours thesis that ended up not being submitted due to a massive falling out with my supervisor. The fallout turned on my determinate negation (Hegel, 2010) of the Habermassian corpus. That sublation led me to conclude wrongly in my supervisor’s view that ‘idealism’ and not the triumphal instantiation of social democracy/socialism as a global way of life lay at the heart of the Habermassian corpus.

There are parallels between the aspirations of abundance theory for an abundance modus operandi and Habermas’ ‘ideal speech situation’ that I take up later in the paper. As a prelude to that discussion in 1988 I was troubled by the fact that Legitimation Crisis (Habermas, 1975) and later of Habermas’ works constantly prophesied the demise of capitalism amidst the impending collapse of the entire socialist project! That collapse and the aforementioned reality check regarding who should pay for university, sharpened my scarcity thinking as I entered the workforce a qualified Primary School teacher.

4 Ironically, many of these ‘beneficiaries’ are among those whose ‘early’ retirements are now on hold as a consequence of evaporating superannuation ‘savings’.
Primary School Teaching circa 1992-3

An indigenous setting was my next influence. After two years’ service as a Year One teacher I quit the teaching profession and bought a school bus that had been converted into a mobile home. My then wife, her daughter and our two cats began travelling around Australia towing our Kombi van behind us. Our meanderings took us to the Northern Territory, where I ended up taking an appointment at a one-teacher school in a remote Aboriginal community near the Western Australian border.

One of the first things I did after taking charge of the school was to challenge the expenditure of Aboriginal Student Support and Parent Awareness (ASSPA) programme money on a free student lunch programme. In my view the kids’ parents/guardians had the wherewithal to feed them, the ASSPA money was for education purposes and we desperately needed books, lots of them. So, over a period of around three months I debated members of the community on this issue and eventually won. Books were purchased with ASSPA money and every pay-day I collected $5 per head from the kids’ parents/guardians. That money bought food and fruit juice which were stored in the school’s freezer and turned into lunches by a community member. Reading performance improved and everyone got fed.

I also won Disadvantaged Schools Programme funds that paid for a multi-function Sports Court. In addition to the asphalt court the grant bought interchangeable posts, nets and balls so that the following could be played: Netball, Basketball, Volleyball and Tennis. Another unforeseen use involved slinging chains over the basketball posts. The make-shift block and tackle enabled the removal and installation of engines and gearboxes. I ran a tuck-shop and the proceeds subsidised school excursions. I instituted school-banking. This enabled some individuals to save and also lessened the impact of gambling on the community insofar as these individuals’ Community Development and Employment Programme and Pension monies didn’t all end up in the hands of the Aboriginal card-sharks who every pay-day blew in, cleaned out the community, and blew out (in aeroplanes during the wet season).
While these were good ‘outcomes’ and while ‘outcomes’ purportedly are synonymous with an abundance mindset, the irony is that they were achieved via a scarcity logic while the history of indigenous affairs is replete with disastrous programmes more consistent with abundance than scarcity thinking. Put simply, one can’t have waste without surplus and in this regard Aboriginal culture as practised today is, in my view, profligate and this profligacy is the ineffable that speaks to the legacy of programme failures. Indeed, the preventable death of a child in my class coupled to an overall sense of futility about the intractability of Aboriginal culture eventually led to my departure⁵. That experience and a thoroughgoing dissatisfaction with my teacher training prompted me to return to study as a means of getting into the teacher training game and hopefully influencing it for the better. This latter goal translated into a PhD scholarship that in turn found me involved in a lot of undergraduate teaching, another source of consternation about abundance thinking.

**Higher Education from a Postgraduate/ Sessional/ Early Academic Career Perspective circa 2001-3**

On the one hand, as a PhD scholarship holder I was limited in how many hours paid university teaching I could undertake between the hours of 9 am and 5 pm. I supplemented these earnings working as a surveyor’s chainman, labouring on week-ends and on early mornings and late evenings during the week. On the other hand, like all fledgling academics I cut my teeth on as much undergraduate teaching/subject co-ordination as I could get and there was lots of this work. The second half of the 1990s was a period when the great academic outsourcing really kicked in and the trend has accelerated to the present where the bulk of undergraduate teaching is undertaken by sessional staff (Li Xuan, 2010). The difference between then and now is that then most outsourcing was to up-and-coming academics, whereas now it is to a vast workforce of broader make-up (Marginson, 2000; Matchett, 2008).

⁵ My time as TIC formed the basis of an Honours thesis titled ‘From ‘C’ Effect to ‘B’ Effect: The rhetoric and practice of Aboriginal self-determination’.
At the time what fascinated me was the general sentiment among tenured staff that they were over-worked. I found this odd once I discovered the formula for calculating workload. It suggested that even though I was a full-time PhD student, my teaching load exceeded that of tenured colleagues. Yet I earned about 25% of the corresponding teaching equivalent of their salary. On this count, I suspect little has changed, ongoing discontent among full-time academics about their own apparently dire workloads and the ‘exploitation’ of sessional staff notwithstanding. I expand this point later. My disquiet then was exacerbated by my doctoral research into the social justice market in education.

My doctoral thesis (Sinclair, 2000) is somewhat controversial. Its main finding is that the primary beneficiaries of social justice initiatives in education are advocates of social justice and not the ostensible target populations such initiatives purport to serve. The explanation of this counter-intuitive conclusion is that social justice in education has become a target market in the production and reproduction of victim circumstances. In this market, advocates of social justice profit from the circumstances of the disadvantaged and oppressed (victims) by devising goods, services and opportunities that trap victims in their circumstances while accruing prestige and rewards themselves (Sinclair, 2002). Much of the entrapment lies in the elision of ‘results’ for advocates (an ever expanding horizon of ambiguous, diffuse victims for whom to construct endless opportunities) with ‘outcomes’ of which there are none for victims.

Extrapolated to my immediate academic environment and from there outwards to the broader academic community engaged in social justice research and advocacy, the thesis enhanced my zero-sum insight into apparent scarcity and abundance considerably. The perception continued with my first full-time academic appointment.

After a year working first as a Part-time Research Assistant and then Full-Time in 2001 I gained my first academic appointment, a one year, research-only contract. The conditions were simple: win back my salary and on-costs in research income as a condition of contract renewal. As luck would have it, I did just that when DEST (now DEWWR) funded me to undertake a national study of PhD supervision (Sinclair, 2004). The motivating factor for the study was David Kemp’s (1999) ‘White Paper’ that identified low completion
rates and poor supervision as characteristic of Australian PhDs. My research took this characterisation a step further by identifying factors associating low/slow completion rates with individualistic, non-interventionist supervisory practices, and, high/fast completion rates with team-based, interventionist supervisory practices. At the same time I was employed by a university characterised by an almost entirely research inactive staff that simultaneously taught large student numbers, predominantly in distance and mixed mode.

The combined effect of my doctoral research, the findings of my DEST research and the extant circumstances of my ‘teaching’ university, led me to focus on the inefficiencies inherent within and between universities that masquerade as a system. If anything, this masquerade is now even more deceptive. Before discussing it more fully, I first mention some additional insights.

Applying Postgraduate Qualifications in the Private Sector circa 2004

By late-2003 my academic career was taking off but my marriage was not. In a bid to resurrect it I quit universities altogether. My wife and I moved to Melbourne and in 2004 I took up a position with a private company engaged in the development and sale of e-learning content and an editing tool for use by teachers preparing and delivering digitally enhanced lessons in classrooms in primary and secondary schools. While the narrative thus far has been quite critical of government inefficiency and waste, this experience taught me that the private sector is equally extravagant and sometimes rogue as well. This is disappointing, because e-learning’s true potential remains untapped as much because of private sector short-term thinking and an unwillingness to invest sufficiently as it is due to the intractability of burnt-out teachers and an arcane school system fossilised in an industrial model.

On the private sector side of the e-learning equation in 2004, the lure was ‘fast bucks’ and hot air was the *modus-operandi*. On the latter my company was exemplary. It claimed an interoperability of our content suite (PCs and Macs) that was a fiction. It also claimed a capacity to translate into numerous languages and alignment with content standards in the USA and elsewhere that was never empirically
demonstrated. Ties were established with the Specialist Schools Trust in the UK and grand research plans envisaged with it as well as school districts in impoverished parts of the USA such as Fresno. MOUs were signed in places such as Malaysia for the delivery of state of the art learning objects in Bahasa Malay. Any and everything was possible if one ignored time and financial constraints and our ‘can do’ attitude typified abundance thinking gone feral.

The company was long ago liquidated with considerable losses sustained by investors. The e-learning landscape is littered with similar private-sector catastrophes, graphic illustrations of abundance thinking. So too are state school systems and Australia’s Public universities. For example, the truth then and now is that despite probably hundreds of billions of dollars and equivalent psi of hot air invested in technology in Australia alone, there is absolutely no plausible or credible evidence anywhere that the use of technology and broad-scale improved student learning outcomes are in any way associated, in schools or universities.

**Restarting an Interrupted Academic Career circa 2005-Present**

By year’s end 2004 my private sector fiasco and a long-delayed divorce caused what might be called an interruption to my academic career. It takes almost no time out of full-time academia to outdate a CV and divorce creates a huge hole in hard-won individual net-worth. Thus I found myself in early 2005 much poorer and downwardly socially mobile in returning to the world of sessional academic labour (and chaining). I co-ordinated, lectured and tutored an array of Business and Teacher Education subjects, hot-desking with a plethora of part-timers. Then in mid-2006, I was fortunate enough to gain a full-time position with the university I had left for the private sector. Once there I quickly applied for and won first a Faculty Deputy Associate Dean then Associate Dean Learning and Teaching position. In the ADLT position I gained entry to the internal power structure of the university and sat on as well as chaired various ‘prestigious’ committees.

One interesting event then was a review of the university’s Academic Board. It found that the Chair ran a good meeting but that the Board
had no idea what it was supposed to be doing. Indeed this was doubly interesting because the university was also faced with plummeting international and domestic enrolments. Simultaneously, it had a surfeit of degree programmes and staff relative to enrolments. This picture is familiar across Australian universities today and even sandstones such as The University of Sydney (Bennett, 2011) now admit it. I suspect Academic Boards unsure of their remit aren’t scarce either.

At the time, despite plunging enrolments many of the academic staff complained about workload. As ADLT I attempted to do something about this with respect to face-to-face teaching operations. I ran a three semester, 13 week calendar and the unwritten ‘cultural’ rule was three hours per week face-to-face contact. I suggested two hours and added that people who wished to do it differently to 13 weeks could do so, for example one week 26 hours intensive teaching (which shouldn’t have been a problem given we were all very familiar with subjects that were totally online as well as residential sessions).

I also tried to make a rule that undergraduate subjects have two assessment items only. In effect, this meant a 33% lessening of teaching contact and a diminished marking load. However, the faculty’s resident National Tertiary Education Union representative was quick to point out that what I proposed constituted a significant change to work practice and rather than enter into a protracted industrial process I dropped the proposal.

Not long after that my situation as an only-child necessitated a move to Sydney for filial purposes. After spending eight months in Sydney yet again engaged in sessional lecturing and tutoring I won full-time employment in teacher education in early-2009. My diagnosis of the present relationship between teacher education enrolments and current and future workforce needs in schools in NSW is that they are decoupled.

Around the state (and the country for that matter) faculties of Education have disappeared, absorbed into super-faculties. These super-faculties in turn are used by Vice-Chancellors as university load-shifting apparatuses, irrespective of labour force needs. The situation is arguably generalisable across most universities of which in turn
there are too many and which offer massive duplication of degree offerings. I suspect that conceiving of universities as an ‘unlimited good’ is at least partly to blame for this situation and if current federal government edicts about broadening participation are anything to go by this conceptualisation will continue for some time.

Moreover the answer to the question ‘what is a university?’ remains open in contradistinction to the plethora of extant providers in Higher Education. While this situation might delight advocates of an abundance mindset, it is perhaps time to summarise my discussion thus far.

**Summary**

As a student radical I fought for the open, endless horizon of possibilities for everyone implied in free university education, that is, I subscribed to an abundance view of universities as an unlimited good (although I wouldn’t have been as succinct then). However, when I realised this apparent utopia was largely subsidised by those for whom the chance was designed but that these intended beneficiaries for whatever reason did not avail themselves of it, my thinking changed. I stopped seeing universities as an unlimited good and since then have increasingly wondered what good at all they are.

Returning to Habermas I now see clear synergies between his proposals for the discursive redemption of validity claims as the modus operandi of participatory democracy, and, the abundance lexicon. An obvious example is the absence of a definitive authority category in both schemata. Similarly, both give preference to ambiguity, diffusion, the personal, possibility and a potentially endless horizon. No facts are admissible. Structure is disavowed. Time is non-directional aside from its self-evident endlessness. With all the dangers of cynicism, the ‘ideal speech situation’ and abundance modus operandi both remind me of nothing more than the Academic Board on which I sat that had no concept of its purpose. It is more than apt that another of this book’s foci is governance. Universities could do with some.

University governance in turn relates to the issue I mentioned earlier of the balance of full-time and sessional staff required by universities.
However, the gorilla in the room where this issue is discussed is not just teaching: it is also research. First, the traditional workload formula employed across many universities of 40% Research, 40% Teaching and 20% Administration guarantees that academic effort will be wasteful. Why? Because a research agenda takes time and money to establish and much of the research conducted by academics into ‘pet’ areas of interest is of questionable utility. On top of this, even a successful and well-established research agenda loses rather than makes money in the vast bulk of cases. ARC grants may well be career-making for the individuals who win them and prestigious for their universities. While research need not be necessarily a profit-making enterprise, the extent to which teaching subsidises research is unjustifiably heavy.

The subsidisation sheds further light on inefficiencies within and between universities that I claimed earlier masquerades as a system. Within most universities one will find large numbers of research centres plus centralised and faculty-level bureaus. In addition, there are often many parallel research methods subjects offered across this blancmange. Similarly, across super-faculty undergraduate offerings, many subjects are duplicated by departments/areas within specialist degrees as opposed to being offered once, generically, across degrees.

Between universities similar phenomena are apparent. Teacher Education is a case in point. In NSW alone there are 17 providers of Teacher Education. Each provider’s degrees are accredited by the NSW Institute of Teachers and there is an explicit effort on the part of this body to encourage diversity of offerings provided they meet the requisite standards. But the key point here is that all must meet the set standards.

Moreover, with Australian schooling heading towards a National Curriculum one has to wonder how it can plausibly be claimed that curriculum areas such as Maths, Science, English and History can be interpreted so dissimilarly as to justify 17 different Teacher Education degree programmes for each school curriculum area. Likewise, while the 17 providers offer an array of subjects about ICTs in schools and pedagogic approaches to the classroom as well as its management, these cannot be so different. It is difficult not to rationally conclude that a lesser number of Teacher Education providers or degrees would suffice in providing a suitably credentialed teaching workforce.
Conclusion

Higher Education in Australia is already driven by an abundance mindset. If the world was not heading into a prolonged recession this would probably be a good thing. Certainly global recovery will depend on innovation, entrepreneurship and other factors characterised in abundance theory as belonging to an abundance mindset and presumably Higher Education has a role to play here. In the meantime, however, the management and organisation of Higher Education requires austerity. For example, imagine how the savings made from rationalising Teacher Education in NSW alone from 17 to say, 7 providers, might be re-deployed to the task of re-engineering a more generically prosperous future. Then extrapolate this approach first to national Teacher Education efforts and from there to other areas of Higher Education at a national level.

Further contemplate ‘teaching only’ universities together with a rationalisation of research effort to genuinely viable/profitable foci of endeavour not tied to any one university. In particular, I suspect that nationally, our current politicians might do well to re-consider their abundance thinking and countenance the possibility that whatever incentives they and universities develop for the disadvantaged, outcomes may not materialise, and some will not be led to water and drink. To my way of thinking it is hard to imagine why anyone currently employed would give up that job in order to go to university, especially if it will cost money and the financial support available is equivalent to the dole.

Similarly, it is difficult to see why someone would switch from the dole to studying at university if all that is entailed is three or four years of harder slog than keeping sweet with the Department of Social Security and a vague promise of employment as the reward.

At the coalface of universities at present, the difficult challenge is managing and organising the rationalisation of Higher Education. Academic managers committed to an abundance mindset will find these tasks conceptually counter-intuitive and practically challenging. Perhaps a better start would be to remove academics entirely for Higher Education’s management and organisation and allow them to
do what they do best, namely teach and research, preferably in areas of interest and importance to others in addition to themselves.
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Chapter 5: Entering the academy: Perceptions of scarcity and abundance

Jeanne Allen

Introduction

While my professional life has in a sense been defined by an ongoing engagement with higher education, I remain a relative newcomer to the sector as an employee. Until 2005, my association with tertiary education had been predominantly as a student involved in undergraduate and postgraduate degrees over roughly 25 years. My transition into work in higher education followed a lengthy career as a secondary teacher and administrator in secondary schools overseas and in several Australian states. In navigating my way through, and playing a role in the management and leadership of these numerous workplaces, I experienced and contributed to the organisational mindsets of abundance and scarcity by which they were strongly influenced. I also developed a “from afar” perception of organisational mindsets in higher education as engendering among people more flexibility, adaptability, innovation, futures-oriented thinking and the like than what I had previously encountered in the secondary education sector. In short, I had envisaged mindsets of greater abundance. In the sections that follow, I discuss how my lived experiences in my first higher education appointment mediated this perception in different ways.

Staff silos and the Image of Limited Good in higher education

I was initially employed in higher education on a two-year contract as a “seconded” teacher from the secondary education sector. The transition represented a sideways career move for me from that of Assistant Principal (Curriculum) in a large secondary college to that of “teacher practitioner” in the Education Faculty of a rural, multi-campus Australian university. My appointment was one of a number
made as part of the university’s partnership arrangements with both the State and Catholic Education Departments of Education.

The major goal of the teacher secondment initiative resonated with that of similar arrangements throughout Australia and internationally: that teacher practitioners would draw on their knowledge, skills and classroom expertise to complement the work of Faculty staff in order to offer under-graduate programs suited to emergent educational challenges (Allen, Butler-Mader, & Smith, 2010; Darling-Hammond, 2006). The initiative, through its (one-directional) shared staffing arrangement, was also intended to enrich partnerships between the sectors. It was anticipated that teacher practitioners, upon returning to their substantive positions in schools, would be able to impart to others their understanding of current practices in higher education and engage school staff in related professional development activities.

One of the most immediate and certainly most enduring impressions I formed on entering the Faculty was that of the hierarchical and seemingly absolute demarcation of roles between general staff, teacher practitioners and academics. While such role demarcation might be considered normative in an organisation of this type, I found it disorienting and somewhat frustrating, particularly given my professional self-image as that of a teacher and school leader. I was suddenly confronted with “teacher practitioner” organisational and cultural expectations that were ill-defined and largely tacit. However, such is often the lived experience of transition between places and types of employment and I accepted that the onus was on me to adapt to the requirements of the role. This was not necessarily an attitude shared by my teacher practitioner campus colleagues. Of the four of us who began, only two completed the two-year contract (the others returning early to schools) and my longer-term colleague did not complete the research higher degree that was an expectation of the role. As I describe later, my aspirations were, however, different from theirs.

My personal struggle with adjusting to role aside, I was perplexed by what I will refer to for the purposes of this book as the scarcity mindsets in and between the three “silos” of higher education professionals and the corroborating scarcity vocabulary that seemed to prevail. Where was the free-thinking, the free speech, the robust debate I had always associated with the academy? Where was the
abundance of ideas – of original thought even – that is surely synonymous with our highest educational institutions? For the most part, in this university at this point in time, silenced. I turn to Foster’s (1965) Image of Limited Good to hypothesise why.

Foster (1965, p. 293) upheld the belief that members of any human society share a common understanding or “common cognitive orientation” which comprises “an unverbalized, implicit expression of their understanding of the ‘rules of the game’ of living imposed upon them by their social, natural and supernatural universes.” The Image of Limited Good exists where members of the society conceive of the desired or valued things, both tangible and intangible, within that society as “in finite quantity and ... always in short supply” (Foster, 1965, p. 296; italics in orig.). Further, it is understood that it is beyond the power of the society to “increase the available quantities” of the valued things (Foster, 1965, p. 296). In other words, there is only so much to go around and the gain of a valued thing by any one individual in the society must necessarily result in the loss or diminishment of that same valued thing by other/s. Accordingly, individuals seek to maximise their security through preserving the valued things they own, which traditionally they do in one of two ways: through complete cooperation or extreme individualism (Foster, 1965). The latter is what, I argue, I encountered within and between the silos of higher education professionals in 2005, a claim which I support below.

I suggested above that the siphoning of people by themselves and others into distinct role groups can be viewed as a norm of organisational life. Following Foster (1965), it can also represent a way of delineating ownership of the valued things. In higher education, as in all organisational and social groups, the valued things change but, for most academic (as distinct from general) staff, they can broadly be categorised as inputs and outputs in research, achievements in teaching and learning, and engagement in the community/external environment. As a teacher practitioner, my workload structure followed the academic model of 40% research, 40% teaching and learning and 20% administration/community engagement. However, my lived experience of the teacher practitioner role differed from that of the profiled academic staff member in a number of ways.
First, there were multiple opportunities for me to work in ways that drew upon my classroom experience and expertise and this work was generally positively acknowledged by others. For example, I was invited to serve as a tertiary education panel member on the consultation committee reporting on the State’s senior secondary school curriculum. I was also granted institutional funding to lead a series of professional development seminars for Education Faculty and partnership school staff. Second, and much less salutary, were my attempts to work outside of my (albeit ill-defined) delineated role.

For example, I was informed of my unsuitability for membership of a variety of Faculty committees, these being the province of academics and members of the general staff; my requests to change from an EdD to a PhD were met with resistance in some quarters, on the pretext that the applied research inherent in an EdD was more within my teacher practitioner domain; and my approaches to general staff with quite mundane requests, such as a tutorial room change, were frequently met with qualified refusals – I should first seek approval from “an academic.”

Less tangible were the negative emotional reactions I seemed to elicit in others. Foster (1965) refers to the suspicion, distrust and jealousy that are evoked when valued things are perceived to be under threat. Unwittingly, it seemed that I posed a threat to members, both within and outside of my group, through, as one teacher practitioner colleague often remarked to me, being “overly ambitious.” Many challenged my motives and questioned my right to act in certain ways. Clearly, I was seen to be encroaching on valued things to which I did not have the right of ownership.

Although contextualised in a personal and therefore subjective narrative, I would argue that the set of experiences and responses touched on above were symptomatic of an environment of scarcity mindsets and that scarcity thinking is used by many within higher education institutions to restrict ownership of the valued things, which is to say, preserve the status quo. However, I now turn to a first-hand account of how mindsets of abundance have initiated for me a whole other set of experiences and aspirations in higher education.
The research higher degree student experience and the abundance mindset

I referred above to my 25-year engagement with higher education as an undergraduate and postgraduate student and to the mindsets of abundance that I had perceived to exist within the sector during that time. In this section, I provide a personal account of my “insider” experience as a student once I began working in the academy.

Figure 1: Appreciative Inquiry “4-D” Cycle (based on Cooperrider, Whitney, Stavros, & Fry, 2008, p. 5)

There were several key motivating factors behind my decision to move from the secondary to tertiary sector seven years ago. It had always been my aspiration to work in higher education and I envisaged, correctly as it turned out, that a two-year secondment would equip me with the requisite skills, knowledge and experience to apply to remain in the area. I was also keen to undertake a research higher degree and one of the provisions/requirements of the secondment was to pursue a degree at this level. My enrolment in an EdD, which I later articulated into a PhD, was not only the most personally rewarding aspect of my beginning tertiary years but also allowed me to bear witness to how mindsets of abundance can foster efficiency, creativity and excellence in higher education. I use
Cooperrider, Whitney, Stavros and Fry’s (2008) Appreciative Inquiry model to frame this part of my narrative.

Appreciative Inquiry (AI) is a cyclical model that can be used to examine and contribute an understanding of organisational life and processes of change (Cooperrider et al., 2008). It comprises four dimensions (see Figure 1), namely, **Discovery** or the act of appreciating and valuing what currently is; **Dream** or envisioning the ideal; **Design** or the process of reaching for and (co)constructing the ideal; and **Destiny**, which involves learning, empowering, and improvising to sustain the future.

The process of **Discovery** for me as a returning RHD student was twofold. First, there was the re-adjustment to undertaking study at this level and in this particular work construct. I had completed a Master of Education by coursework four years earlier and a Master of Arts by research a decade before that. Coupling study and research with the demands of other core elements of my new role, such as teaching a whole suite of undergraduate courses for the first time, inevitably presented challenges. While there was a 40% time load allowance for research in my work schedule, I was also expected to use some of this time to participate in collaborative research projects, not necessarily associated with my RHD work. Therefore, part of the discovery process for me was to evaluate and manage the time available to me. Second, like many fledgling doctoral students, I had doubts about my capacity to realise success at such a high cognitive level.

However, my anxiety and doubts were allayed as soon as I began seeking supervisory and collegial support. Specifically, the interactions and conversations I had with my supervisors and other researchers were, from the very outset, engaging, challenging and provocative. Dialogue was rich and debate was rigorous. The mindsets and vocabulary of scarcity that I was constantly encountering in other facets of my work were now absent. By way of example, I draw on Jansen and van den Heuvel’s (n.d.) vocabulary of scarcity and abundance (see Table 1) to illustrate my experience of the sharp contrast between the closed mindsets I habitually encountered in higher education (e.g. in teaching /learning and administration) and those I met in research and through RHD study. In the former,
connotations were limited, structured, closed and factual; in the latter, they were ambiguous, unstructured, open and experiential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scarcity in higher education</th>
<th>Abundance in research/RHD study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>Ambiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal</td>
<td>Personal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear</td>
<td>Diffuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fact</td>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Contrast between mindset vocabularies in higher education (adapted from Jansen and van den Heuvel (n.d.))

Thus, I found myself in a positive space and one in which, to return to Cooperrider et al.’s (2008) AI model, I was enabled to Dream and envision an ideal future around research and to Design and co-construct ways in which to best seek to determine this ideal.

There were both pragmatic and more esoteric motivating factors that determined how I envisioned the future. First, to be eligible to apply for an academic position at the end of my secondment, I needed to complete my doctoral work in a timely manner. Second, I wanted to produce work at the highest level of which I was capable and, third, I believed it important to win the esteem of others in the academic field. This then was the Dream. The Design was an iterative process. I sought out sound advice from my research supervisors and built upon their advice throughout the course of my degree through my own experiences and through interactions with others. A summary of the Dream and Design dimensions of my doctoral research can be found in Table 2 (at chapter’s end).

Inevitably, the realisation of the ideal was at times fraught. Some elements of my design, such as doing some thesis work every day, were unrealisable. While able to seek funding, I was only successful to a limited degree and, while gaining the support of my supervisors, I found it difficult, as a teacher practitioner, to articulate from an EdD to a PhD. However, as I describe below, my outcomes were, for the most part, positive.
Cooperrider et al. (2008) define *Destiny* as the active empowerment of the *Dream* and the *Design*. My *Destiny* as a researcher/beginning higher education employee was realised in a number of ways. In the spirit of abundance, I focus briefly on the three most productive outcomes. First, although my candidature was part-time, I was able to devote 4000 hours over three years to my RHD study and was admitted into the PhD in 2009. Second, I have been able to develop, both during and since my RHD work, a reasonably strong early career researcher publication record. Third, within one week of my PhD conferral, I was appointed, in my sixth year in the academy, to the (now tenured) position of Senior Lecturer in an inter-state university.

These outcomes, while achieved through my own sustained hard work, would not have been possible, or indeed imaginable, without the liberating and empowering forces that emanated from the mindsets of abundance in research management and leadership in the higher education institution in which I began my academic career.

**Conclusion**

Through providing above a first-hand account of my transition into higher education, I present no more than my own perceptions of how scarcity and abundance have influenced my seven-year engagement in the sector. While the argument could be raised that my perceptions of mindsets in the academy are merely representative of, and heavily influenced by, my own professional inclinations and aspirations, I would argue that they nonetheless elucidate to some degree the lived experience of the academic. I certainly make no claim to objectivity. Further, as Jansen and van den Heuvel (n.d.) point out, what matters in adopting and interpreting a particular mindset is the way in which one perceives certain situations.

I have presented above an essentially binary view of mindsets of scarcity and abundance in higher education. Others refer to the mindset continuum – ranging from extreme scarcity to extreme abundance – but this was not my experience in entering the academy. As is generally the nature of personal narrative, I have referred to specific sets of circumstances in a particular environment at a nominated period of time. None of the points of my argument can be extrapolated or considered in any way generalisable. For example, in
the university in which I now work, I operate under a whole new set of tenets emanating from an entirely different scarcity/abundance paradigm. Nevertheless, it is my contention that closed and open mindsets, stances of scarcity and abundance, are primary influences in limiting or fostering growth and in stymieing or advancing positive and reconceptualised futures in higher education.

Table 2: Summary of the Dream and Design dimensions of my doctoral research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dream</th>
<th>Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timely completion</td>
<td>• Say “no” to other tasks/requests where possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be totally committed to the task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do some thesis work every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Write every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meet regularly with supervisor/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit some polished written work to supervisors well before every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Keep meticulous records of progress and constantly assess progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality research</td>
<td>• Seek good supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept the hard knocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Read voraciously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Be self-critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Seek out funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get to know the library staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Get to know the Office of Research staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer esteem</td>
<td>• Submit to the best journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accept and act upon feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Submit abstracts for the most esteemed international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attend all institutional research seminars, workshops, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Articulate from an EdD into a PhD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 6: The Different Training and Development Opportunities of Full-Time and ‘Sessional’ Academics

Li Xuan

Introduction

Since the 1970s, the use of sessional academics in Australian universities has intensified. However, the training and development opportunities provided to them are minimal (ALTC, 2008). This chapter reports research that identifies and explains training and development issues facing sessional academic staff. It draws on a mixed method case study methodological approach involving ten sessional academics, two full-time academics and their managers at X University Campus. It taps the different experiences of professional development and explores sessional academics’ concerns and feelings about professional development.

Theoretical Considerations

Sessional academics in Australian universities are defined as university tutors, lecturers or research fellows not in tenured or permanent positions and employed on an hourly basis or for a particular task (ALTC, 2008; Bassett, 1998). They are often the teaching staff with the most direct contact with university students. Since the 1970s the use of sessional academics has intensified. All universities depend heavily on sessional teachers (ALTC, 2008).

University of Wollongong Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic and International), Professor Rob Castle stated that:

‘Sessional teachers are the hidden part of the massification that has taken place in higher education in Australia over the last 30 years. One of the greatest achievements of the Australian higher education system has been the growth of student access to university study, and this could not
In this sense sessional academics perform a critical role within the university and make a strong contribution to the quality of teaching (Anderson, 2007; Coombe & Clancy, 2002). They spend comparatively more time consulting with students and on marking their assignments than do full-time academic staff (Nicol, 2000). Efforts to support sessional academics’ training and development can be beneficial to sessional academics, universities and society.

However, the present situation is that sessional academics have few training and development opportunities (Churchman, 2005). Like the vast bulk of full time tenured academic staff, many sessional academics do not possess a formal teaching qualification. This limits the pedagogical knowledge on which they can build (Kimber, 2003; McCormack, 2003).

Commonly, full time academics without formal teaching qualifications are encouraged to undertake pedagogically focused professional development ranging from short intensive courses to extensive graduate certificate programs. For some universities the latter have become a compulsory induction component for newly appointed academics.

However, no such requirement exists in the case of sessional academics. Full-time academics who are new to a university receive training programs that incorporate teaching. However, this situation does not always apply for sessional academics (Coombe & Clancy, 2002). The two most popular ways of assisting these staff are providing printed materials that outline teaching responsibilities and, informal discussions about class activities that may occur between them and full-time staff lecturing or coordinating the subject they teach.

Although some institutions have improved the way they manage and treat sessional academic staff, most universities have not adequately supported these academics in a systematic way (ALTC, 2008; Watters & Weeks, 1999). Most of the workshops and development opportunities for sessional academics appear to have been used to achieve systemic or institutional quality assurance and they are not
organized in ways that fit the working patterns of sessional academics (Blackwell, Channell & Williams, 2001).

Moreover, the training methods applied to sessional academics still focus primarily on information provision rather than improving teaching techniques or discipline knowledge. Indeed, sessional academic staff find these training sessions to be poorly designed and implemented without reference to their needs (Anderson, 2002).

The increasing number of sessional academics has led to a major bifurcation in the academic professions. On one side is a group of employees who are already well-educated and have well-paid permanent full-time jobs with training and career development opportunities. On the other exists a group of people who have unsecure and dispensable jobs with little opportunity for advancement (ALTC, 2008; Watters & Weeks, 1999).

Having sessional academics who are given inadequate training and support may lead to student complaints and may also undermine the achievement of educational objectives. If universities are to be quality enhanced, sessional academics’ training and development needs must be constantly met (Watters, Christenson, Ryan, Weeks & Arcodia, 1996).

In summary, the literature about sessional academics’ training and development needs indicates little systematic effort has been made in Australia to support sessional academic professional development. A key theme in the literature is that sessional academics receive fewer training and development opportunities compared with their full-time colleagues. This paper provides evidence that the deficiencies in the training and development of sessional academics need attention.

In order to achieve this goal the research on which the paper is based investigated sessional academics’ perceived training and development problems and, through assessment of the causes identified and with reference to extant research literature, to recommend changes for improvement.
Empirical Findings

The mixed-method case study was situated at X University Campus. There are 120 sessional academics at Y Campus, compared with 28 permanent academic staff (include both permanent full-time and permanent part-time members). Thus, sessional academics constitute a major component of this university’s teaching resources.

The campus profile is consistent with the research literature that identifies the trend in universities to increasingly draw on casual academic staff to tutor and lecture the growing student population (Marginson, 2000). This depth of reliance on sessional academics highlights the need for the university to have professional development programs that take account of the special needs of sessional academics.

Table 1 (at chapter’s end) provides an overview of the sessional academics involved in the study on which the paper is based. As Table 1 shows, overall, the participants are diverse in age, gender, socio-cultural background, education background, and work experience.

Of the ten sessional academics, two full-time academics and two managers who formed the interview set on which this paper is based, some of them work in more than one university, a common phenomenon amongst sessional academics.

The Academic managers in the sample are in charge of Y Campus’s training and development programs. The interviews with the two managers focused on recruitment and selection of sessional academics, sessional academics’ teaching quality, and training and development opportunities for sessional academics. Table 2 (at Chapter’s end) overview these participants.

The interview questions were derived from concerns identified in the literature, namely:

- Background and experience of participants (ALTC, 2008; Bassett, 1998; Gappa & Leslie, 1993; NTEU, 2007).
- Experience of induction (ALTC, 2008; Churchman, 2005);
Ongoing support & involvement in department (ALTC, 2008; Kimber, 2003; Watters & Weeks, 1999);

Training & development opportunities (ALTC, 2008; Anderson, 2002; Churchman, 2005);

The main themes explored in the interviews with managers were:

- Induction for academics (ALTC, 2008; Churchman, 2005);
- Support for academics in the performance of their duties (ALTC, 2008; Kimber, 2003; Watters & Weeks, 1999);
- Training and development programs for academics (ALTC, 2008; Anderson, 2002; Churchman, 2005).

In addition, the study analysed the documentation about the professional development of academics. Three important documents relating to academics’ training and development opportunities were reviewed to identify academic, especially sessional academic, training and development opportunities. They are the Academic Induction Operations document, the Professional Development Framework, and the Professional Experience Program.

The data analysis is presented in the following three sub-sections that highlight important aspects of sessional academics’ training and development opportunities relevant to this paper.

(i) The university fails to provide adequate and relevant professional development programs for sessional academics

Among the interviewees, only three sessional academics said there were some training courses on researching, marking assignments and course advising/coordination, but they did not always attend because the courses were offered during the teaching breaks. Not all sessional staff remain in the city in which the university is located during holiday periods. Four sessional academics said they had not received any training and development opportunities.

Only the three sessional academics who had worked in the university for more than seven years said that they had attended the Professional Development Program (PD program). They believed the PD program was good for inexperienced sessional staff. The program was about
improving teaching skills with a particular focus on catering for the individual needs of international students. The program also covered areas like providing rich feedback in assessment, and teaching staff roles and responsibilities. These interviewees believed that they gained good insights on multicultural learning and active learning in a tertiary context from the program. They commented that:

‘PD days is about adjusting your teaching for more active learning or dealing with student from a variety of cultural backgrounds. And being culturally sensitive. I’ve got some good insights on – um – particularly, on multicultural learning and – in a tertiary level. And also in – probably in active learning, how to engage your students more. They’ve probably been the best ones I can remember and I particularly remember a few stand-out kinds of presentations from different people.’ (Interviewee 1)

‘I thought that was one of the best things they’ve ever done – those staff development.’ (Interviewee 2)

However, these staff received no payment for attending and only one interviewee said ‘just one or two times’ he was paid for participating in the professional development program. One manager said, ‘sessional academics don’t get paid for attending the professional development programs but it’s an opportunity for them to mix with their colleagues and take part in a true professional development’. The other manager commented that there had been some discussion at senior management level about paying sessional academic staff to come to professional development for many years.

However, this manager also said they had a budget and it was limited and they could not do everything they would like to do. This manager added that they provided free food and refreshment to encourage people to attend:

‘Free food and refreshments work in any culture. I think, to encourage people to attend things and – something we’ve included being an Australian culture and having a very strong culture associated with drinking alcohol – like, wine and beer and so on as socializing – we do try to ensure that at the end of any session there is a social event so that people can start performing those relationships.’ (Manager 2)

However, this manager’s view was not consistent with some sessional academic beliefs. For example, Interviewee 1 commented:
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‘If they’re asking us to turn up there should be some token payment… they provide some refreshments and whatever – is that supposed to replace the payment? I don’t know.’

Sessional academics further commented that the university had only provided PD programs in the teaching breaks, and that did not suit everybody.

‘Perhaps, later at night… after five o’clock to have a few sessions for a few hours or maybe even a Saturday. So somewhere outside the normal timeframe so that you’ve got a greater chance perhaps of being able to attend. I think the timing of them are quite important…I think it should be every semester that there should be an offering to all sessionals and, perhaps, rather than having just at the end of that semester or before the next one have something during the semester as well.’ (Interviewee 1)

However, the managers said they had tried to schedule the programs at the friendliest times for sessional academics. Manager 1 believed semester break was a good time for holding the training programs since ‘it means there’s more availability of teachers because a lot of casual teachers are actually making their career out of casual teaching or teaching for several universities’ and they might be only available during the semester breaks. The other manager said the professional development was generally an all day event but the academics could come for a part of it if they could not come for the whole.

According to this manager, sometimes 20-30 sessional academics attended while at other times only about 10 sessional academics came. It seems that this is not a big number compared to the 120 sessional academics employed in total at the campus. This manager agreed that there might be more sessional academics attending the program if it was held during the teaching period rather than during semester breaks.

In contrast to sessional academic staff, full-time academics stated that they received a number of training and development opportunities and they got paid for attending. One full-time academic (Interviewee 11) mentioned that ‘some of the programs like computer updates were only provided to the full-time academics’. Besides the PD programs, the organization also provided financial support to full-time staff via the University’s Professional Experience Program (PEP). The program offered grants to full-time staff to apply to go to conferences or workshops.
The PEP grant encourages us to attend conferences in our fields to keep our knowledge up to date. A number of staff here have been able to take advantage of those PEP grants.’ (Interviewee 12)

The managers acknowledged that sessional academics did not have the same training and development opportunities that full time academics did.

‘Some financial support for permanent staff who want to do further study or who want to go to conferences and so on. But that’s not available to casual academic staff at this point.’ (Manager2)

The differential treatment of sessional academics was also evident in the following statement from one manager:

‘Well sessional academics don’t have the same opportunities that full-time academics do.’ (Manager 1)

This manager also commented that it might be a good idea to consider whether longer-term sessionals should be entitled to this kind of financial support. This manager had actually tried to give some opportunities to some longer-term sessional academics:

‘I have had discussion with a few casual academics and I’ve agreed that if they can come up with a good submission I will put it forward for consideration by head office.’ (Manager 1)

Unfortunately, the manager informed me that no sessional academic member had applied. This manager further explained the situation like this:

‘If I get a paper accepted at a conference I get leave to go to the conference and I may get subsidized to go to the conference. And the subsidy usually cuts out at $1000 for a domestic conference and I think about $2000 for an overseas conference. So it only covers may be half of what you’d expect of the conference expenses. So it’s a contribution rather than anything else.’ (Manager1)

This manager’s comments indicate that the grants only cover perhaps half of the conference expenses, and the academic still needs to pay for travel and expenses to conferences. Sessional academics in general are not likely to be able to afford such expenses. Among the
interviewees, one sessional academic who had worked for the university for more than ten years commented that he had been offered this kind of financial support for his professional development. He described his experience as follows:

‘They offered me a chance to do the Doctorate degree at no cost. And I turned them down…they have a deal where they offer some sessionals that and I think the way they can offer for free is that you do some research associated with the university because their research profile is low.’ (Interviewee 1)

Overall, the managers believed that it was difficult for the university to be responsible for sessional academics’ professional development. They also thought sessional academics’ professional development probably needed to be driven by sessionals themselves. Manager 2 commented that sessional academic staff got paid a much higher hourly rate for their work in the lectures and tutorials than permanent staff, and that was meant to remunerate them for all the other things that they missed out on.

‘There’s a philosophy that academic staff are responsible for their own continuing intellectual development and currency in their discipline.’ (Manager 2)

The other manager explained the situation like this:

‘It’s difficult for the university to drive it (sessional academics’ professional development) because the casual academics for all intents and purposes are independent contractors. They’re all – virtually running a business of being a contract teacher. And – you know – they’re, if you like, they have several clients. Several different clients and their focus is not necessarily on this…Some of these sessional teachers are teaching at many different universities. You know I’ve got a teacher who’s teaching at least four, including … University. So which university has the responsibility for these teachers’ development? Some of these teachers are doing so many hours. When are they going to fit in the professional development?’ (Manager 1)

Among the interviewees, only four of the sessional academics said they had attended self-financed training courses. Interviewee 1 who was teaching Marketing said she had done some IT related courses. Interviewee 2 was doing a master degree and was paying with government help. Interviewee 3 had done a master degree in the past and had been to some conferences. Interviewee 8 had done some
courses in business analysis certification programs and software trainings in business objects. This academic was teaching in the IT area but was a business analyst and had spent a lot of money doing business analysis courses.

In summary, sessional academics stated it was difficult to self-finance their training. Nine out of ten informants believed that time and money were the major obstacles to their professional development. They explained that for a sessional to earn enough money on which to live, they have to teach as many hours as possible. There is little money or time for professional development. They said they were worried about their financial futures and could not afford the absence from teaching to self-finance training courses. One interviewee described his concerns this way:

‘Probably the cost. If there was something available that I wanted to attend I probably wouldn’t attend it because it would cost probably hundreds of dollars. Hope it would be provided free.’ (Interviewee 3)

Again,

‘Time and money. I also have another job and I am busy. If you don’t work you don’t get paid and being a teaching staff you don’t get many gaps if you are teaching multiple places because they sort of overlap with each other. So it’s a problem.’ (Interviewee 8)

Only the permanently employed academic was likely to invest in self training and development at this university. Notwithstanding the self-interest of such claims and the obvious comparison with other professions that routinely self-fund professional growth, the comments indicate a concern amongst these sessional staff.

The interview data support the research literature that shows sessional academics have limited access to training and development opportunities compared with full-time academics (Bassett, 1998; Coaldrake, 1999; Herbert, Hannam & Chalmers, 2002). Combined, the experience of sessional staff contrasted with that of full-time staff is consistent with research findings that there is a widening gap within the academic profession that is threatening to produce a two-tiered workforce. On the one hand, there are the full-time staff with good conditions, secure positions and training and development opportunities and, on the other hand, there are the sessional staff with
poor conditions, uncertain position and lack of training and development opportunities (Kimber, 2003).

(ii) The documentation fails to account for sessional academics

The Academic Induction Operations document reflects that the induction held by the campus is an introduction to special features of the academic delivery process for academic staff members. The document suggests that induction can help the new employee settle into the role by informing new employees of information that is necessary to carry out their role. It also offers an opportunity for academics to communicate with key contact people, establish relationships, and gain a good understanding and knowledge of the departments and associated staff members and functions.

The document states that it is a contractual requirement that all academic staff attend the Induction Meetings conducted prior to the two major terms (Term 1 & Term 2). All new academic staff must be inducted using the ‘Employment Checklist – Academic Staff’. This specific checklist introduces new staff to special features of the academic delivery process, as well as information pertinent to their role. The checklist aims to ensure all key information is provided to new staff.

Based on the information gathered from this document, it seems considerable effort has been made in inducting academics and ensuring new academics settle into their roles. However, the usefulness of the induction is limited because there is no obvious provision for staff feedback in the induction material. Moreover, the document does not mention anything about sessional academic training and development needs.

The ‘Professional Development Framework’ suggests that X University is committed to investing in the development of its staff and nurturing its intellectual capital. The document also suggests that the university has an organizational responsibility to ensure that funding and time are allocated for staff to be able to participate in professional development. It also expects that staff take personal
responsibility for keeping their knowledge and skills current and for engaging in learning new skills and practices in partnership with colleagues and supervisors.

The document views professional development as a cycle. The professional development cycle starts with the induction, orientation, and probation processes associated with the recruitment of new staff. This is followed by on the job training, as required, in the application and practice of skills, knowledge and qualifications for the functional roles and the level of appointment of the job.

The document recommends that it is important for the organization to establish performance goals and provide feedback on performance, including identifying developmental needs. The developmental needs of staff may be met through a range of professional development options including attending professional development courses, undertaking formal courses to prepare for advancement to the next level, or other developmental activities such as attendance at conferences and undertaking special projects.

The document also recommends that X University will strive for fairness, transparency and equity in the determination of access to professional development with reference to need rather than other measures. Fairness is afforded by the opportunity for all staff to apply for a range of professional development activities and by staff entitlement to professional development activities based on organizational needs and negotiated during individual professional development planning.

However, there is no separate policy either about sessional academics’ training and development or how to ensure their professional development and teaching quality. The interview data indicate a strong contrast between the documentary data and the reality of the situation of sessional academics.

The Professional Experience Program (PEP) is designed to enable staff to participate in programs enhancing professional knowledge, skills and abilities. Staff development is resourced from the training and development budgets of the university’s campuses. All staff who have been employed by the university for a minimum of one year are
eligible for support. Five categories of programs have been identified to assist staff through the PEP program including, support for Master and Doctoral level programs with relevance to the university’s activities; a Professional Doctorate with two years service; support for presenting papers at a conference in Australia or attendance at a conference; presenting papers at an international conference on a case by case basis; and non-standard programs, workshops and short courses relevant for carrying out contract responsibilities.

It seems that considerable effort has been made to support academic development. Again, these documents neglect sessional academics. It seems that when these programs are prepared in an attempt to support academic development, sessional academics are not visible.

Overall, the documents give the impression that X University has systematic policies, programs and procedures for supporting all academics. However, the documents reveal the general lack of university assistance for supporting sessional academic training and development. This is consistent with the research literature (Brown, Goodman & Yasukawa, 2006).

(iii) Failure to recognize the importance of pedagogical practice (teaching).

All of the interviewed sessional academics believed that they had been offered a formal induction course every term. However, 7 out of 10 of them believed that the inductions had been repetitive and had not been well structured. In their view, most of the induction was about administrative matters. For example, when asked for his thoughts about the induction Interviewee 1 replied:

‘Sometimes it’s quite repetitive because when you’ve been here for a while – you tend to - a lot of it was about - more the administrative side of things and organizational structure which obviously you know fairly well.’

Similarly, Interviewee 10 responded to the same question:

‘You are bored and you feel like you are wasting your time. Sitting there yawning all the time… You already know and you repeat it every term…nothing about your teaching skills.’
This is consistent with ALTC’s finding that although induction is considered important in all universities, most induction focuses on policy, resource and compliance requirements with only brief reference to teaching and learning (ALTC, 2008).

In contrast to the views of the ‘old hands’, new staff members thought the induction was useful in some areas. They also pointed out that they had the chance to meet their teaching teams and get to know the organization and its culture and mission:

‘It’s useful. It covered a lot of things. It was more about procedures, like how much break time to give the students and things like that... And because I was new they were useful to me. It was a chance to see some other faces of people who are also sessional. I think it was quite adequate for what its purpose.’ (Interviewee 3)

The induction then was useful for helping new employee settle into the role and understand what was necessary. However, new staff still believed that the induction should be improved. They wanted to know the ways in which they must behave to fully participate in the organization and how to cope with teaching issues. A typical comment was:

‘I think it should concern more on which outcomes the university really expects from their staff and how to cope with teaching issues. It might be too broad, but should discuss these in brief.’ (Interviewee 5)

Some sessional academics suggested that it would be good if the induction could cover some aspects of effective teaching, rather than just focusing on purely administrative issues. They believed the ability to teach was very important. For example, Interviewee 1 suggested:

‘There are a lot of people coming that have good academic qualifications and they’ve got their doctorates and things like that perhaps, but they do not have very strong teaching background. When you are teaching sessionally you actually need some training about how to teach if you haven’t got a strong teaching background.’

The managers explained that the inductions were similar every semester and the purpose of the inductions was to make sure the sessional academics can meet the key people they are working with, namely the academic leaders and lead lecturers on their courses. The
managers also said sometimes they would spend some more time on special things that had happened in the university or in the business.

‘It’s similar every semester. Sometimes I give a bigger emphasis, for example, to plagiarism – I mean we have plagiarism problems. So next semester I’ll be spending some more time on plagiarism. I’ll also be spending some time on the teaching peer – I’ve got a peer observation program coming up so I’ll be talking about that most probably.’ (Manager 1)

Based on the information gathered from documentary data and interview data analysis, I realized that considerable effort was made to induct academics and to ensure that new academics learned the required corporate behavior. However, only a few aspects of teaching and learning were included. Sessional academics who had worked at X University for more than one year realized this and believed that the induction needed to be improved and that it should cover effective teaching.

**Conclusions**

This study shows that sessional academics represent a growing body of staff at X University. Sessional academics are mainly used for teaching tutorials and lecturing at the campus, a situation one might speculate also exists in other institutions. There is quite strong commitment to X University on their part. However, the university does not recognize the importance of sessional academics and consequently judged by the way they are treated in training and development opportunities. These are largely unavailable to most sessional academics.

The analysis reveals that the experience of training and development opportunities is very different for full-time academics and sessional academics. The analysis also reveals the general lack of organizational assistance to support sessional academics’ training and development. It seems that several training and development programs and opportunities were and possibly still are available for all academic staff, and some financial support is available for all academic development. However, only some of the training and development
programs are available for sessional academics, and perhaps only for long serving sessional academics.

In addition, while training and development documents reveal the importance of training and development to all staff members, there is no indication from the interviewees’ narratives that sessional academics are offered the same opportunities. Moreover, there is no policy or practical focus on the specific training and development needs of sessional academics. Some training programs offered by the university, such as the induction course, have been repetitive, focused mostly on administrative information rather than improving sessional academic teaching skills.

Based on this study, it is reasonable to propose that that training and development programs of this university should be organized in ways that fit the working patterns of sessional academics. In addition, the university needs to include relevant teaching and learning components in its induction processes. Moreover, the university needs to regularly evaluate the induction and collect feedback from participants on how to improve it at the end of each semester’s induction.

At a more generic level, there is a *prima facie* case that the university needs some formal, systematic policies and procedures to identify and interpret sessional academic training and development needs. This could be done in collaboration with some experienced sessional academics since they are more familiar with the training and development needs of sessional academics.

Timing of the training and development programs is an important issue. The data reported in this paper indicate that it is best to hold these programs during teaching periods, on weekends or during mid-term breaks.

The issue of payment is also highlighted. The data provide grounds for believing that staff who attend training and development programs should be paid, and that sessional academics who attend should be recognized with such documentation as attendance certificates. This issue is part and parcel of a forward-looking performance management system for sessional teachers that contains
a corporate strategy aimed at the professional development of sessional academics.

Table 1: Overview of participants (sessional academics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Employment history at X University (years)</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Master</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>DBA (Doctor of Business Administration)</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Overview of participants (full-time academics & academic manager)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age range</th>
<th>Cultural background</th>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Full-time Lecturer &amp; Professional manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40-50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>Full-time Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>Academic Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Academic Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 7: A Study of Innovation in Teacher Education

David Lynch and Richard Smith

This chapter reviews three studies of an innovative teacher education program (Bachelor of Learning Management, BLM) for implications about how to proceed with pre-service teacher education. It concludes some researched-based propositions for improving the learning success of students in formal learning settings.

The education literature indicates that what teachers do is fundamental to students’ success in learning (Hattie, 2009; Fullan, 2007). Many commentators (such as Smith and Lynch, 2010; Fullan, 2007; Hattie, 2009; Hargreaves, 1997 and 1998) argue that schooling and teaching require major reforms given the radical changes that have occurred in society in the past twenty years and the increasing learning-based research that is now available (see Fullan, 2007; Hattie, 2009. Hargreaves (1998) for example states that “reflecting upon the research basis of teaching, much teaching, specific lessons and acts of individual attention to students are nothing more than face saving disguises for pedagogic incompetence”.

He goes on to say that the “dominant models for creating, disseminating and applying professional knowledge for teachers are now almost entirely inappropriate and ineffective, a serious waste of material and human resources and add to the low morale and the serious shortage of teachers” (Hargreaves, 1998, p.17). If Hargreaves is only partly correct, the pre-service and continuing professional education of teachers is an enormous strategic task for the formal education sector.

This paper is about one such enormous strategic task. The paper argues that if the teacher is the key to improving learning success,
then the point of innovation for learning success has to occur in their initial preparation. To investigate this proposition the paper investigates the Bachelor of Learning Management (BLM) approach to achieving these ends. The BLM is selected because it specifically set out to achieve such outcomes. If “improvement” of the quality of learning in formal education is the goal, then the context of formal education today must be explored before moving to other matters.

**The Knowledge Economy**

Since the early 1970s, the “de-industrialisation”, “de-nationalisation” and “deregulation” of national economies have become characteristic features of life. Technological developments have accelerated to affect every aspect of the home and workplace. Developments such as these point to the emergence of a “new world economy”: an interconnecting and interdependent arrangement that generates unprecedented international economic and cultural competition through the exploitation of “know how” (OECD, 2006; Beare, 1995). Moreover, the core centres of this shift are increasingly in China especially as the traditionally dominant European countries and the USA struggle with national debt and declining economic competitiveness. This new work economy is known as the Knowledge Economy (OECD, 1996). The key commodity in the Knowledge Economy is knowledge and its use to create new products and services (Donkin, 1998; Gibbons, Limoges, Nowotny, Schwartzman, Scott & Trow, 1994; Moser, 2003; Doyle, Kurth & Kerre, 2000).

It is now established in the education reform literature that schools today, as the fundamental formal education unit in most societies, face a different kind of world to that of the past (Fullan, 2007). For example, in the West, the structure and character of families has changed from the nuclear family of the “home” and the nurturing family assumed in much curriculum development. Similarly, in China, the “one child” family is significantly different to previous generations of larger more cooperative units on which Chinese society depended.
Furthermore, there are new patterns of employment and underemployment, greater mobility and new concentrations of poverty in both rural and urban settings as these changes become entrenched (Hargreaves, 2003; Edgar, 1999).

Employers seek different kinds of education outcomes in their employees. The outcomes referred to are ones that place great importance on the diffusion and use of information and knowledge as well as its creation. The associated skill-base, it is argued, allow incumbents to gather and utilise knowledge, where strategic “know-how” and competence are developed interactively and shared within sub-groups and networks. Continual innovation and learning is and will be driven by a hierarchy of networks (OECD, 1996).

School systems everywhere are thus under increasing pressure to meet these new challenges and to prepare students for a globally competitive and technologically driven world economy (Schofield, 1999; Kovacs, 1998). These circumstances are highlighted in Australia by the concept of schooling that has changed little from its Nineteenth Century roots, (Edgar, 1999; Connell, 1998; Ryan 1998b).

Given the school sector’s charter to prepare the next generation for living and work in Knowledge Economy circumstances the need for change cannot be dismissed as just another lunatic “economic rationalist” ambit claim. On the contrary, it has broad social justice implications for individuals, families and society. School systems now have a policy role and an imperative to participate in the emergent society that requires school graduates to have new skill and knowledge repertoires and conceptual toolkits (Smith and Lynch, 2010). This is quite a new role compared to the recent past.

Given this context some fundamental questions should now be asked of schools. What should teaching look like? How should schools be organised and managed and how will teaching be done? What will mark off the old from the new? What will teachers in the most “out-there” schools (if there are any) be doing or not doing that would stun today’s
teachers and administrators? What will be different in the way teachers are recruited, prepared, perform and managed?

But consider another proposition. Maybe teaching has not reached the zenith of its potential and, given the present historical circumstances characterised by rapid social change of a global nature, it isn’t even in the right ballpark. Maybe the existing model of how we prepare people to do schooling and teaching — developmental psychology, constructivism and all the other fads of contemporary schools — has reached its limits? Rather than being at a pinnacle of achievement, maybe schools and teaching have a long way to go.

We do not wish to suggest that there have not been any advances and achievements in schooling and teaching. The concern with the individual, the advent of specialised schools, the expansion of the curriculum to account for all rather than a social class-defined segment of students, the focus on “learning” are all enlightened moves. Further, over several decades now, the value of education has moved to centre stage for individuals, communities and nations.

As John Naisbitt (1998), author of *Megatrends* observes, education is now the number one economic priority in today's global economy and is in the same family as economics, social class and international sport as a core concept of the 2000s. It is there on the backs of great educators like John Dewey, Pestalozzi, Piaget, Gagne and Jerry Bruner to name a few, along with the countless teachers and administrators who have toiled to make a contribution for a better society.

The development of mass education and ferment in teaching are nearly seventy years old. The list of educators above dates back two centuries. Now, if we think about the last five to ten years, it is difficult to identify innovations of the same grandeur and impact as those of these people and those like them who laid the foundations of schooling and teaching. Maybe there are not any more things about schools and teaching to be discovered? The foil to the idea that the
model is perfected lies in whether we or others are really happy with what we have in schooling and teaching. The institution would need to be fulfilling for parents, teachers, students, employers, commentators and ourselves, and be producing graduates whose capabilities are so impeccable that there would not be any point in seeking something else.

That is, it would be presumptuous to assume that schools and teaching developed in previous centuries remain adequate for another historical age in the form that is presently familiar. The reality is that there are numerous criticisms of schools and teaching from multiple sources, based on the fact that schools and teaching continue to do what they have always done rather than being bold and taking fresh directions. Also, there are increasing operational problems in the education system as it adjusts to both national social issues and shifts in the geopolitical state of the world. Governments and commentators point to the need to overcome old, well-tried solutions that worked in the past but now reveal the limits of the present models and practices.

Education systems are efficient at processing students but there is little evidence that the outcomes of schooling are more equitable despite the expenditure and rhetoric. Moreover, there are now doubts that the preparation of students is appropriate for the conditions that the young will face after school. Perhaps the time has come to rethink the whole offer so that the school and teaching legacy is not maintained by short-term trade-offs that favour the system and status quo rather than individual students, families and the national interest.

### Changing How Teachers are Prepared

In the following section we identify features of the Bachelor of Learning Management (BLM) program and how this approach to teacher education appears to contribute to successful learning in formal education settings.
Prior to 2001, teacher education programs were predominantly the 4-year Bachelor of Education (BEd). The program that preceded the BLM included studies in sociology, psychology, curriculum planning and a conventional “practicum” regime. In general, the program focused on what students know, rather than how they use that knowledge.

The BEd program was “Faculty centric” in that its content and delivery were determined by the university and local schools accommodated student teachers for a program of practical experience. While some academics established strong relationships with individual schools, university-school collaboration was largely tokenism in the sense that its structure and content had already been decided in absentia.

One of the most obvious features of the existing BEd program was its relative disinterest in outcomes in a time of speedy social change (OECD, 2002). While there had been the occasional cosmetic revision, the Bachelor of Education (BEd) program had changed little since the 1980s so that it hardly fitted the 1970-80s social ethos. Given the social movements of the late 1990s, its social relevance shortcomings were obvious. It was subject to the OECD generic point that the time was right for new solutions rather than re-runs of flagging remedies.

For the development of the BLM, that meant a search for new solutions and strategies to replace the existing system of producing teachers. Smith’s 2000 article and his appointment to the Central Queensland University Education faculty to undertake that task proved to be a catalyst because it coincided with system-level determination to rethink and rework the education arrangements in Queensland Australia.

In 1999, Queensland State Education: 2010 (or QSE2010) was published (Education Queensland, 2000). It documented changes taking place in Queensland society and economy in the context of
broader social change in Australia. It introduced the local education community to the term “Learning Society” and argued that policy change was required so that students were prepared for membership of a learning society (Education Queensland, p.11). In later iterations of QSE:2010, policy was established for the transformation of teaching and curriculum and its infrastructures to ensure pre-school-to-adulthood education and training pathways for all students. In addition, teachers should be “managers of the learning experiences of children” rather than being gatekeepers of knowledge (Education Queensland, p.8) and that “teachers must continually renew their pedagogy and skills” to meet rapidly changing student and social needs (Education Queensland, p. 9).

Furthermore, and reinforcing some core elements of Smith’s (2000) argument, the QSE2010 policy stated that graduate teachers should be supported “by innovative pre-service training that prepares teachers to teach in the new economic, social and cultural conditions” in order to prepare younger generations for their respective places as contributors to the global “learning communities” (Education Queensland, p.10). It is not difficult to see that this fortuitous policy blueprint endorsed Smith arguments and provided a powerful mandate for education change. Education Queensland’s stance was especially important when it came to mobilising industry support for such changes in teacher education.

**The Bachelor of Learning Management Program (BLM)**

By 2001, Smith, Lynch and Mienczakowski argued that the BLM no longer prepared “teachers” but was intent on graduating “learning managers” (Smith, et al, 2003). This publication signalled the significant changes in the rationale, content and delivery model of the program. The core premise of the program was that graduates would graduate “workplace ready”, with capabilities including specialist knowledge and skill relevant to the school as a workplace, yet be “futures orientated”. This latter characteristic, the capability to initiate
and achieve alternate teaching and schooling futures, represented the continuation of Smith’s “critical” perspective re-worked for an entrepreneurial and innovations culture. It embodied personal characteristics such as courage, planned risk taking, imagination, intuition and creativity (Lynch, 2004) and was aimed at halting the much discussed reproduction function of teacher education.

The original conceptual basis of the BLM degree\(^6\), was anchored in four concepts namely: Futures; Networks and Partnerships; Pedagogy; and Essential Professional Knowledge (See such background examples as Hargreaves, 2003; Marzano, Gaddy, Dean, 2000; Topper, 2000; Darling-Hammond, 2000; & Wehmeyer, Palmer, Agran, Mithaug, & Martin, 2000; Reigeluth, 1999; Shulman, 1986a and 1986b). Program unit titles signalled the purposes of the degree and included Learning Management, Futures, Networks and Partnerships, e-Learning Manager, Entrepreneurial Professional, Essential Professional Knowledge in which Dimensions of Learning\(^7\) became the core, and Portal Task, amongst others. The first BLM graduates entered the workforce in 2003, following a compulsory internship.

The BLM represents a change of balance in teacher preparation between “curriculum” and “pedagogy”, or the “what” and the “how” (Smith, 2000). Smith believed that a BEd tendency to emphasise curriculum development encouraged the postponement of the moment of implementation so that the doing teaching element of the process is left to the devices of the individual teacher, later. In that conception of preparation, the “how to teach” element is in danger of being thought of as a matter of subjective preference on the part of individual teachers.

That is, each teacher graduate can make up their own pedagogical practice by drawing on a host of other BEd program elements such as multiple intelligences, coloured hats, Productive Pedagogies and New

\(^6\) In line with the regulatory agency of the time: Queensland Board of Teacher Registration.

\(^7\) For details see McREL located at \text{http://www.mcrel.org/dimensions/whathow.asp}
Basics, whole word approaches and so on. Such a model mirrored the practices of teacher education staff, each of whom had their own favourite theories and approaches. This double fragmentation forms an important BLM critique of the BEd.

Fragmentation encourages a vast proliferation of teaching approaches amongst teachers and it relegates core principles and theory of pedagogy — teaching — to the realms of mystery. It is not difficult to see that if every teacher has a few favourite, unique approaches to their work, the number of pedagogies in use across a school or system reaches astronomical proportions. It is not too fanciful to propose that fragmentation goes some way to explaining why there are problems of consistency in what and how areas like literacy, numeracy and science are taught. In short, the practice of locating teaching skill in the creative minds and actions of talented individuals is analogous to the work of poets but is also an indicator of an immature profession. Any semblance of professional coherence based around professional teaching standards is an oxymoron in this radical individualistic approach. It is perhaps an explanation of why accreditation bodies champion “teaching standards” as aspirational outcomes but opt for lame procedural “standards” that almost anybody can fulfil.

The original BLM game plan had four distinctive elements that define what it means to graduate from the program. These elements are: the idea of Learning Management; the new content indicated earlier; a move from knowing a lot about a few theories (“illumination”) to being able to apply theories and undertake teaching that has definite outcomes (“performativity”); and significant decision-making and resource-based partnerships with the teaching industry. We briefly discuss each in turn.

1. Learning Management
The BLM program is underpinned by the concept of Learning Management. The concept has little to do with the bureaucratic notion of “management” in that it was derived from the architectural term “design” — an artful arrangement of resources for definite ends—
- and is best rendered as “design with intent” (see Fletcher, 2001). Learning management then means an emphasis on ‘the design and implementation of pedagogical strategies that achieve learning outcomes.’ That is, in the balance between and emphasis on “curriculum development” and “pedagogy”, the emphasis is definitely on pedagogical strategies (Smith and Lynch, 2010).

While clearly anchored in pedagogic strategies, the term also serves another purpose. It attempts to sign-off what is called “teaching” from its past and to reposition teachers as knowledge workers who have a key role in preparing the next generation for work and life in the 2000s Knowledge Economy. This concept is explored in greater detail in subsequent chapters. Learning Management should therefore be viewed as being disruptive to the traditional notions of education and schooling in that it aims to transform the role of teachers and teaching. The term learning manager, the practitioner of learning management, signals this change in the teacher.

Underpinning the learning management premise is a new set of knowledge and skills---collectively referred to as a “futures orientation” in the comparative study that follows. It attempts to prepare the mindsets and skill sets of graduates for conditions of social change that pervade local and global societies in the 2000s. The BLM architects were aware of a prevailing “traditions” of teaching in schools. They realised that graduate teachers had to fit such a profile, at least in the early stages of their careers before a change to a “futures orientated” practice of teaching could occur.

They also realised that in the interregnum, new teachers are bound to be socialised into the traditions of schools. It follows that while graduates have to be “work place ready” on graduation, it is hardly enough for the circumstances of the 2000s. The program was then designed to overcome this conundrum. Put simply, the BLM is aspirational in that it seeks to disrupt the current teacher education paradigm and in doing so, intervene in the conventional teaching practices of schools.
2. New content
In line with learning management, the BLM syllabus centred on four knowledge clusters: Futures; Pedagogy; Networks and Partnerships; and Essential Professional Knowledge. These clusters arose in collaboration with classroom teachers and various industry stakeholders as well as being scoped by a trans-disciplinary literature. The content was heavily influenced by research and theory to avoid promulgating yet another “good idea” and to ensure that the professional knowledge BLM elements had substantive intellectual support.

3. From “illumination” to “performativity”
The BLM utilizes a device known as Portal Tasks. Portal Tasks are not practicums in a conventional sense, but designed experiences with stringent in-school requirements linked to on-campus courses structured so that students cannot escape the requirement of demonstrating their understanding and application of really important knowledge, especially pedagogical strategies. Portal Tasks cannot be successful if the classroom teacher mentor (the BLM student’s learning manager) is not fully aware of the overall program agenda and committed to it professionally. Without Portal Tasks, the BLM model is radically insufficient and would resemble the conventional BEd.

The Portal Task model is illustrated in the assessment algorithm developed for each unit: one piece of assessment for the conceptual issues and the second piece for the demonstration of performance in the portal tasks. In short, the assessment regime intentionally sets out to ensure that student teachers get to know the field and are able to demonstrate applications of core concepts and procedures. Such an outcome is a necessary condition of the BLM model.

---

8 Notice the wording: ‘committed to it professionally’. Having a ‘business-to-business’ partnership is not necessarily the same as teachers and university staff liking it or believing in it. The message is that CQU pays its permanent casual staff and school-based mentors and supervisors to teach and support the BLM rather than personal views of what comprises teacher education.
4. Partnership
In order to achieve the intentions of the BLM, the approach relied on partnership arrangements with employers and schools. The reason for this is that if the brand name is the detailed specification of pedagogical strategies that achieve learning outcomes, then all participants in the production of graduates must know and be able to work with the same agenda. There is no advantage in the on-campus programs championing the design of pedagogical strategies while school-based staff do “curriculum development”, for example.

Moreover, in keeping with the BLM program objective of reducing the number of personal, folk pedagogies teacher educators, teachers and schools use, aligning students and participating teachers both on campus and in schools was and remains a priority. In order to do reach this end, the conceptual and procedural knowledge that is taught on-campus must be demonstrated by students in real-life settings such as schools and supported by in-school staff. Accomplishing this outcome goes some way in reducing the theory-practice gap so often attributed to teacher education programs.

The partnership concept is fundamental to all of these aspirations. It implies that employers and schools are “partners” in a strong, substantive sense in so far as they jointly conceive ideas and policies, together with the provision of necessary resources. An important new element is that partnership entails the deployment of mentors from the employing agencies. These people work side by side with Faculty staff so that the division between “us” and “them” is at worst minimised. The “we” in this model are all part of the community of learning that is the BLM culture and program. To reiterate, a serious partnership with employers, schools and with each teacher mentor, is the core of the BLM, and the model will not function without it.

The overall aim of the BLM is captured by an expectation that BLM graduates are both workplace ready and futures-orientated when they graduate, namely that they:
1. can perform the role of teaching to a professional standard guaranteed by the experiences that they have had in the four knowledge areas;
2. have a futures-orientated mindset and demonstrated capability to be enterprising and contributing to making a real difference in learning outcomes in clients no matter the level or who they are;
3. can demonstrate know-how in the workplace that has few divisions between theory and practice;
4. have received mentoring from classroom teachers who know the logic and content of the BLM and pursue both; and
5. have successfully completed a compulsory internship undertaken in the last year of the degree in which they perform as practising, in-service teachers.

The approach contrasts with the idea that schools or indeed employers must, by definition, have “induction” programs for new teachers to ensure that they can do the work for which they are paid to do and that teaching prowess and expertise can only accrue over a long period of experience.

**What Research Says about the BLM**

Having discussed the aspirations of the BLM, aspirations that many may (and do) find hortatory and unrealistic if not dangerous, we outline the findings of three studies of the BLM. These studies, while small scale and fragmentary, go some way towards illustrating the possibility and efficacy of the BLM concept and, importantly provide an empirical platform for a further rethink of an expansion of BLM principles in a concluding section of this paper. Moreover, to our knowledge, the ACER study is the only systematic, independent evaluation of a teacher education program in Australia.

The first study was conducted by Ingvarson et al. (2005) of the Australian Council for Education Research (ACER) in 2004 and published in 2005. The remaining two are doctoral studies by Lynch.

---

9 We do not oppose induction in programs that are premised on performance and development, but we have strong reservations about the taken for granted assumption that newly graduated teachers must be shown how to teach in real life teaching settings. This to us seems to be a faulty conception of pre-service preparation and a politically unwise position for an erstwhile profession to adopt.
Lynch compared BLM and BEd program graduate teachers’ perceptions about teacher preparation with those of their practicum mentors, while Allen investigated the capacity of the BLM to bridge the theory-practice gap between the university and the workplaces in which BLM students operated. We now outline the findings of each, beginning with the ACER Study.10

The ACER study was commissioned by the then Australian federal education minister, Dr Brendan Nelson. While CQU BLM developers were consulted, especially on the “futures” element that was completely unique to the BLM at the time, they were not involved in the ACER study.

The study had two parts. The first was a Lickert scale survey of graduates from teacher education programs across Queensland in 2004 (n= 536) and of school principals of these graduates (n= 324). The response rate was 26% for teachers and 40% for school principals. The survey questionnaire generated data about the following questions.

1. What are the perceptions of beginning teachers about the effectiveness of current teacher education courses in Queensland?
2. To what extent were teacher education courses effective in preparing teachers for their initial teaching roles?
3. How did BLM graduate perceptions about course effectiveness compare with graduates with perceptions of other graduates?
4. What factors characterise effective teacher education programs?
5. What distinctive qualities of the BLM were most effective in preparing teachers for initial teaching roles?

The second part of the ACER study was an observational phase conducted in October and November 2004 with 31 teachers who had graduated in 2003. Eighteen of these teachers were BLM graduates from the Noosa or Rockhampton campuses of Central Queensland.

---

10 In 2004 Dr Brendan Nelson, then Australian federal minister for education, commissioned a study into the BLM. This study can be located at http://www.acer.edu.au/documents/BLM_280905.pdf
University. Thirteen teachers had graduated with a BEd. qualification from other Queensland universities. Observers were trained by ACER to use interview and observation schedules adapted from the Queensland Professional Standards for Teachers until they attained a high level of reliability (Ingvarson et al, p.18). Pairs of these trained observers interviewed and observed each sample teacher twice, during a literacy-oriented classroom session and a numeracy-oriented session respectively.

The observational study sought to determine whether, given the hype around the BLM, the classroom performance of graduates from the Bachelor of Learning Management (BLM) course at Central Queensland University (CQU) could be distinguished from graduates from other teacher education courses.

The ACER study concluded that Learning Management approach, that underpins the BLM program, has empirical evidence for claiming that it achieved outcomes consistent with the rhetoric of the program. Thus:

The BLM approach is producing graduates who believe that they are better prepared for the first year of teaching than are graduates from other Queensland universities. This belief is supported by observational evidence that showed a sample of BLM graduates taught at a significantly higher standard than a sample of graduates from other Queensland universities. School principals also believed that BLM graduates were better prepared than other graduates (Ingvarson et al, p.78).

Ingvarson et al. (2005) found that definite components underlie the BLM’s apparent success. We briefly outline these now.

1. Emphasis on training in a core model of effective pedagogy

The BLM program requires university staff and teacher mentors to present students with a basic architecture common to effective learning management, no matter what is being taught. This architecture is found in the BLM Learning Design Process (8 Learning Management Questions) and in the Dimensions of
Learning. It provides students with a common framework for designing pedagogical strategies that achieve learning outcomes in students. The framework puts high priority on linkages between outcomes, pedagogical practice and assessment. The program that actively promotes a “consistently applied, ‘deep structure’ model of pedagogy, based on standards for effective teaching, appears to have born fruit” (Ingvarson et al, p. 79).

2. Active engagement in *learning how to use* the model

Students are regularly placed in workplace situations from the beginning of their program. Work placements provide the opportunity and responsibility to apply the principles of effective pedagogy as defined in the program. This element of the BLM requires that teachers in schools understand and apply the same, agreed model and have the capability to mentor and coach students. The university and employer partnership plays a strategic role in achieving this outcome.

3. Strong *linkages between theory and practice*

The assessment algorithm noted earlier ensures that all BLM graduate teachers not only get to know the field but are able to demonstrate applications of core concepts and procedures *in situ*. This *essential* element in the BLM links university units to workplace experiences in what is called the Portal Task. Teacher professional accountability is enhanced in a regime that requires student teachers to demonstrate that they can promote student learning on the basis of expertise.

4. An authentic *partnership between schools, employing authorities and the university*

The partnership concept between stakeholders in which equal but different contributions are recognized and valued lies at the heart of the learning management concept.
5. Standards-based teacher education

According to Ingvarson et al., the BLM program is a thoroughgoing example of standards-based teacher education. This means that the criteria for judging the success of the program are external to both the graduate performances and the program itself. The emphasis on instructional rather than learning theory assists in achieving this outcome.

Having now elaborated the ACER study and its findings we now review two further studies into the BLM. In his doctoral study, Lynch (2004) found, through an attitudinal survey of final year BLM students (n= 221; response rate of 37%) and their final practicum mentor teachers (n= 153; 25 % response rate), and through a series of focus interviews with mentors, (n = 85) that program outcomes across all the CQU BLM campuses varied. Some were little different from the BEd offered by the university previously despite lexicon changes in course names etc while in other campuses, there was a process of transition from the BEd to the premises of the BLM (Lynch, 2004).

In general terms, Lynch found strong outcomes in achieving “workplace ready” graduates across all six CQU domestic campuses, but strikingly less evidence of a “futures orientation”. He argued that unless mentors of BLM students (teacher-in-schools) were accomplished in exercising a futures orientation, rather than assuming that mentors would be prepared to teach it, this aspect of the BLM would not be fully realised. For example, Lynch did not find any schools or teachers in his study that were attuned to the global social changes taking place around them. Consequently, there was little reason to account for them in the preparation of teachers or presumably, their own students in any of Lynch’s sample schools.

Allen in her doctoral study conducted at one of CQU’s campuses compared the logic of the BLM with the effects of university lecturers and school mentors on the teaching practice and beliefs of recent
graduates employed in a school system. Her results indicated a number of important points. First, where there is a weak partnership between schools and the university, the logic of the BLM breaks down and often becomes non-existent as the “BEd” mindset and practice dominates both university and school staff. This gap shows itself in such things as failure by university staff and in school mentors to establish and nurture the required relationships with schools, principals and teachers.

While pressure of work and other factors play a part, some university and in turn school staff do not comprehend the fundamental importance of partnership for the achievement of learning management outcomes or do not see it as a worthwhile exercise. This finding suggests that the “us and them” mentality of conventional school - university teacher education programs is exceedingly resilient, despite efforts by both the university and employers to initiate a different relationship and practices.

Second, as with Lynch’s findings, where the logic of the BLM is unknown to or is not sustained by either lecturers or mentor teachers, the logic is undermined and has little effect on the graduate teacher. Here Allen provided evidence that university staff either ignored the BLM theoretical framework or actively undermined it by substituting idiosyncratic, alternative, interest-based content in their teaching. Allen’s data show clearly that the school ethos of every teacher doing “their own thing” was shared with university-based staff. Similarly, teacher mentors required student teachers and later graduates to conform to school practices whether they fitted the formally agreed model or not. For others, there were both misunderstandings and often little understanding at all of BLM concepts and practices.

Allen’s study shows that amongst both university and school staff, the appreciation of the BLM’s avowed intention to develop a “consistently applied, ‘deep structure’ model of pedagogy, based on standards for effective teaching” (Ingvarson et al, p. 79) was weak, in
spite of several years of professional development and learning, with university-based staff and in the school system.

Third, where lecturers and teachers insist on teaching their own knowledge components outside of the BLM curriculum, such as substituting constructivism and learning theory for elements of instructional theory or Dimensions of Learning, or requiring student teachers and new graduates to conform to school practices that run counter to learning management precepts, the BLM model collapses.

To be fair, our own experiences in higher education indicate that there are few rewards in universities for the conduct of programs like the BLM that are heavily “professional” and are time-heavy in the development stages. Similarly, if the BLM model is poorly understood and implemented, it appears to have few upsides for schools as the different demands of the BLM are perceived and interpreted as “additional work” when viewed from the old “prac” model context.

This is especially so when key players constantly reinforce the term “prac” in face-to-face discussions and in written communications between the university and schools. Under these conditions, preparing the next generation of teachers is more a chore for schools rather than a core part of the professional work of certified teachers with definite positive spin-offs for teachers, schools, universities and communities.

In short, the studies by Lynch and Allen show that the very elements lauded by Ingvarson et al. as the drivers of a successful pre-service teacher preparation are paradoxically the ones perhaps most likely to generate resistance in university Schools of Education and in schools. This university and school co-production of the status quo by self-generating mindsets and interpretive frameworks remain as fundamental reasons why it is difficult to change the practices of schools and Schools of Education. The next round of learning management implementation then must take these politico-contextual conditions into account.
On yet another front, over a decade has passed since the initial development and inception of the BLM program concepts. There has been an explosion in the science of learning and in the interim period developments in domains such as Web 2.0 have shaken the orthodoxy of traditional schooling by introducing many new potential teaching and learning media. While such emergent trends formed the content in BLM courses over a decade ago, they did not constitute core knowledge competencies and importantly they were not modelled for program delivery.

Further, both university teacher preparation regimes and the schools are faced with quite far-reaching effects on teaching practice by these developments that in the BLM model can only be resolved collaboratively in real-time. Given these findings we suggest that it is time for a further change and updating of BLM precepts.

**The Implications for the Future of Teacher Education**

The research evidence reported here provides pointers for what needs to be changed if graduates are to be better prepared for work in an emergent world because it identifies areas of constraint and restraint in teacher education context. More specifically, we can conclude that the foremost ingredient required in teacher education is a university-school partnership that is effective not only because it is sustainable in respect to performance but also as having real mutual benefits. Put simply, unless teacher education gets partnership right, all other attempts to re-engineer teacher education will be defeated by different logics in the various sectors.

It is reasonably clear in the ACER evaluation (Ingvarson et al, 2005), in Lynch’s work (Lynch, 2004) and especially in Allen’s study (Allen, 2008), that an agreed agenda across the university teaching staff, the school-based mentors and the students, prevents significant break downs in understanding and purpose across participants in teacher education. It confirms research findings in other fields where merely fostering customer orientations in order to guide innovation and
research is insufficient to guarantee quality outcomes (Wagner, 2009, pp. 8-9). Lynch’s findings about “futures-orientation” for instance shows that waiting for the university, individual schools and their staff to make the required changes is unproductive. Put simply, partnership and mutual benefit are the sine qua non of change processes in teacher education that overcome differences in sector logics.

Allen’s work provides specific insights into why breakdowns occur. They include:

1. The unequal contributions made to successful graduate outcomes by the workplace and university and the need to coordinate them;
2. The need to manage real or potential fragmentation in the on-campus teaching, workplace performance and mentoring that supports the performance stands of the program; and
3. the effects of hierarchy where the responsibility for program design and development lies with the university but the workplace has greater responsibility for implementation than ever before.

We should add that the requirements of teacher accreditation agencies also act to stifle innovation in teacher education programs. Teaching “standards” for example are in reality descriptors of practice in selected theoretical models. They are so mundane, inert and removed from the outcomes of quality teaching that they lack credibility. The application of one such “standard” to fighter pilot training illustrates our point, namely: “F-18 pilots continually improve their professional knowledge and practice.”

Such a standard says nothing about the knowledge and skills base required of combat airmen. Yet, teacher graduates are being trained to use such generic, contrived words as if they will improve teaching practice. In reality, they can mean anything, thus reinforcing the idea that teachers devise pedagogy in unique ways. Such risible approaches defeat the purpose of a standard-setting project that sets out to ensure exemplary teacher practice and support of quality learning.
It follows that significant input into the conceptualisation, planning and implementation of a teacher preparation program must originate from stakeholders defined more broadly than university committees, “prac” consultative groups and registration agencies. The university-school-employer nexus needs to be seamless so that teaching staff and students experience continuities in curriculum, responsibilities and obligatory procedures, desired outcomes and purposes. Compared to the present model where not all collaborators are treated equally, these are new contexts for teacher education and the other learning industries (Wagner, 2009, pp. 8-9) with new opportunities.

These attributes in turn demand a different mode of relationship management compared to what we argue are the now obsolete hit-and-miss “prac” model monopolised by school settings. In the case of the BLM, the effective partners are those schools and organisations that can be described as innovation suppliers, or those that orchestrate what happens in the workplace in ways that are usable for the BLM’s assumptions and underpinning knowledge sets to produce teaching graduates. The relevant players are those that understand the positioning of the “student teacher” and “graduate teacher” in the emergent education market and the social trends that shape the capabilities required by graduates. In contrast to the conventional teacher education model, it is no longer valid or indeed possible to see innovation as just the more effective transmission of the teacher education curriculum to student teachers.

The present and future context comprises disparate constituents with interests in the outcomes of the schools and training organizations, that “speak back” (Nowotny et al. 2003). That is, there are additional, competing claims on schooling and learning, and in turn, teacher education that arise from outside education institutions. Moreover, the realisation is growing that learning and teaching no longer refer exclusively to the work of traditional teachers or university lecturers. Learning, and in turn people who can manage learning, are demanded more generally. The challenge for schools and teacher education is to
get their respective practices synchronised with social conditions and new expectations for learning and schooling, and in turn “teacher” (sic) education.

It follows then that the rhetorical reliance on “partnership” and collaboration in teacher education requires a re-assessment of “collaboration for what?” If university staff and schoolteachers are “symbolic analysts” (Reich, 1991) who take professional pride in their capability to achieve agreed outcomes, and who network widely in order to ensure that the appropriate learning service is enjoyed by clients, then they are knowledge workers.

In the knowledge-creative society, the corollary is that, compared to the teaching/teacher mindset of conventional teacher education, knowledge workers celebrate the capability to reach mutually agreed goals in a collaborative context rather than prizing unique approaches and individual preferences, despite their individual excellence in being creative, innovative and entrepreneurial. This change of mind and skill set or needed make-over for teachers and teaching (Ministerial Advisory Committee for Educational Renewal, 2004, p. 9), we have repeatedly referred to as learning management, a concept that goes well beyond merely tweaking conventional teacher education programs.

From ‘Partnerships with Schools’ to ‘University - Learning Industry Syndications’

Bauman, like Nowotny et al. (2003), indicates that learning occurs in an increasingly unpredictable and irregular social world in which supply and demand is neither linear nor stable, and labour is shaped by complex patterns of anticipations, time and space. The implications of Bauman’s observations are that there is a need to shift from content delivery to capacity building, from supplying curriculum to co-creating curriculum, from supplying education to navigating learning networks (McWilliam and Haukka, 2008, p.663).
Taking these implications one by one, it is apparent that: (1) capacity building has intent, namely the capacity to use particular capabilities that enable the “teacher” to operate in a knowledge-creative society; (2) co-creation clearly implies more than mere collaboration with people and things beyond the classroom and the school. Strategic alliance for mutual benefit is a more appropriate term; and (3) navigating learning networks refers to the capacity to mobilise resources and make extensive use of face-to-face and the Internet with the implications such shifts have for teachers, schools, schooling and teacher education (Awazu et al. 2009, pp. 51-58).

Moreover, taking the core elements of the research into the BLM as a benchmark for progress towards such ideals, the key driver of an effective teacher education model is a university-school partnership that is focused on performance and mutual benefit. This proposition implies an emphasis on developing a performance and development model of effective pedagogy that is reachable only if there is agreement across all sectors about the efficacy of the model and its outcomes. A spin-off from these imperatives is that theory and practice are linked in action-oriented ways to reach agreed ends in what we referred to earlier as “standards-based” teacher education.

Our argument is that the conventional partnerships between schools, employing authorities and the university are unlikely to achieve these outcomes systemically if left to individual universities, employing authorities and states. To reiterate, it is paradoxical that the very characteristics that our research has shown to contribute to a successful program are, we think, the ones most likely to generate resistance in university Schools of Education and in schools.

In order to deal with this minefield, our view is that the preferred arrangement for strategic alliances with the producers, orchestrators, brokers, disseminators and users in teacher education—what used to be called collaboration or even partnerships— is “syndication” (Smith and Lynch, 2010, pp. 230-241). Using the research presented earlier as the theoretical platform, the underlying premise of syndication is the
co-creation of what might be loosely called a maturing of the community of practice concept in contemporary society.

Syndication goes beyond what is currently understood by partnerships and alliances to an agreement about making available relevant services, resources, capacities and content to other players “in the game” to use for agreed ends and mutual benefit. Put simply, a syndicated partnership is developed without the impediment of traditional employer or university boundaries and lines of demarcation that rely on “us” and “them” distinctions.

For illustrative purposes, we envision a syndicated model for teacher education analogous to the “teaching hospital”, so that there is a physical synergy between local schools, community bodies and employers and a university faculty. The resulting “syndicate” develops collective goals and language sets that authorise the co-opting of members’ businesses in order to harness knowledge, skill and resources for mutual benefit, namely highly accomplished graduates and constantly up-skilled teachers (Smith and Lynch, 2010).

The core contribution of syndicated business is that purposes, outcomes and procedures are agreed in advance and subsequent operations are made seamless across each participating organisation so that the syndicate marches to its own collective drum. As the research showed, while the BLM was an attempt to reposition teacher education for a changing society, it did not go far enough in taking on the politico-contextual conditions of the various systems that make up teacher education and their competing purposes. Syndication means that boundaries between university, school, college and community organisations blur for the purposes of teacher education outcomes. Moreover, once syndicate agreement is reached about purposes, outcomes and procedures, participants are responsible and accountable for delivering them. In this way, syndication adds depth and immediacy for users across agencies and organisations and operates for the mutual benefit of all players (Smith and Lynch, 2010).
Syndication has definite benefits for shifting school, schooling, teachers, teaching and teacher education into the 21st Century. It depends for its success on real-time social collaboration that is at the heart of all professional activity. It is not difficult to see how syndicated arrangements offer potential advantages to schools and universities as they struggle to improve teaching and learning practice and reach performance targets.

A syndicated agreement then is the core element in our envisioned teacher education program compared to the more traditional matters such as the fleeting moments of “prac” teaching arrangements, school visits and so on (Smith and Lynch, 2010). Our view is that if governments, universities or school systems want to intervene in the teaching practices of schools or the “quality” of teacher graduates then there is little choice but to syndicate the whole operation. Other approaches have proved ineffectual against legacy and boundary-riding factors in universities and schools.

**Conclusion**

The “message” of this paper is that the very elements lauded by Ingvarson et al. in their independent study as the drivers of a successful pre-service teacher preparation are paradoxically the ones most likely to generate resistance in university Schools of Education and in schools. This is perplexing to us even if we can appreciate that individual university and school staff and the public servants who staff accreditation agencies have their own views about teaching and teacher education. We can also appreciate that committees will have a Group Think flavour to them that tends to extinguish unconventional ideas and approaches. Nevertheless, as Godin (2011) puts it: “How dare we, then, decide to just wing it? To skip class. To make up history. To imagine that science is a matter of opinion, something optional, a diversion for the leisure classes...”

In short, on the basis of our research, operational experience and socio-cultural conditions, we propose that teacher education in the
form and function that it is undertaken in Australian universities has reached its use-by date. There are research-based options for significantly altering that prognosis. Now is the time to do it if there is sufficient political will to make it happen.
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Chapter 8: Teacher Professional Development in Norway: Backdrop, here and now and looking ahead

Gunnar Grut, Tine Arntzen Hestbek & Inger Langseth

In this chapter, the authors point out some challenges in Norwegian teacher education in the development of teacher professionalism, based on both research and experience. The historical backdrop presents the Norwegian context. The authors discuss teacher education and how to understand research based teacher education. The Research and Development project for teacher students constitutes an example of this approach to teacher training. Finally, the authors present the outline of a current pilot project based on a community of practise that aims at empowering future teachers.

Backdrop

The history of Norwegian Teacher Education is closely related to Norway’s national development. The struggle for national independence and for a decentralized government has been a core characteristic of Norwegian culture. In this struggle, teacher education has played a role voicing alternatives to centralized rule, thus rendering capable local involvement in the affairs of school and state.

Teachers in primary and lower secondary school were educated at teachers’ seminaries outside the big cities, whereas teachers in upper secondary and tertiary education were being educated at universities in central cities. This dichotomy of place and purpose has contributed to the creation of two teacher credos. The seminary tradition emphasises personal relations and local uniqueness. The academic tradition is directed towards school subjects derived from scientific disciplines, claiming international or even universal scope. This is a classic paradigmatic debate on professional ethos grounded generally on the needs of society versus the requirements of academic disciplines.
Teacher-training practices carried on in both institutions are challenged by an expanding international educational regime of measurement - and accountability. What is to be measured - and how; who is to be accountable - to whom? Traditionally, Norwegian teachers have been oriented towards their classroom practises based on their own experiences in school, with a democratic mandate given by the national curriculum (bildung).

Today, these professional practises are questioned, and true professionals no longer answer to standards set by teaching experience itself, but to tomorrow’s agenda set by currents hitherto unknown. Populist and elitist ideologies, as well as impulses from political to corporate leaderships are all challenging teachers’ professional autonomy. Improving teacher practise based on the best from both the seminary and the academic traditions, while taking international trends into account, demands creative thinking and action. Today’s real challenge still lies in how to develop educational professionalism within each practitioner, be it the teacher or the student teacher, and to develop the spirit of curiosity and questioning in all learners from an early age.

Nineteenth Century teaching seminaries have, of course, developed into modern teachers’ colleges but they are still lagging behind as far as research is concerned, while the universities for their part have been lacking in the time and a true predisposition towards developing the interactive skills student teachers need to survive in modern classrooms.

In order to marry seminary virtue to academic enquiry, we need a teacher education based on a dynamic interaction between academic studies, pedagogy, didactics and in-service training. This would result in a comprehensive, coherent and complex teacher education, where a key competence is the ability to weave a strong social fabric, and where individual progress makes sense to the individual.

Both the uniqueness and the complexity of the Norwegian systems of teacher education for primary and secondary schools bear witness of the political struggle to balance our national culture between peripheral and central powers. The European
continental bildung tradition (loosely translated as learning for life) is now challenged by the Anglo-American testing tradition, which is currently being interpreted into a Nordic model. This is still an ongoing process, where new groups are creating their own narratives. Teacher education needs be able to deconstruct these approaches to create continuing and evolving school practises in order to meet changing social, practical and intellectual needs.

**Here and now**

Evaluation of Norwegian and international teacher education has directed attention to the necessity of bringing about professionalism built on an academic tradition. A development away from the so-called ‘seminary model’, which had previously characterized teachers’ colleges, has included increased emphasis on research-based knowledge and training, and less emphasis on imparting experience-based information. Traditionally, the seminary model stressed here-and-now competence in the sense that student teachers were to acquire a platform of fundamentals at the start of their professional career.

Many would today claim that this does little to support the teacher, the school or the larger society in the long run. In his book *Kenguruskolen* (1990) (*The Kangaroo School*) Tom Tiller points out that the Norwegian school system is characterized not by a systematic development towards definite goals over a period of time, but instead hops easily and uncritically kangaroo style from one educational fad to another. The new teacher education reform makes explicit demands for research-based and practise-based professional training.

In their evaluation of NTNU’s partnership model (a program of cooperation between the practise school and the teacher education institution) Haugaløkken and Ramberg (2005) conclude that the model prioritises practical skills for student teachers in a here-and-now perspective, and only to a lesser degree contributes towards advancing students’ competence in research and development (R and D), the latter laying the basis for future competency development. This fits in well with the description given in NOKUT’s (national evaluation committee on higher education) evaluation report from 2006 concerning primary school teacher education, where it states that R and D-work has little priority, and that as a rule, students have little
information about research done by teacher trainers, and in addition, that this research has little relevance for their training and practise in the teacher/school perspective.

Another national committee pointed out the dilemma created if and when an academicism of professional training should lead to an outcome where teacher education moves its focus away from the practical fields student teachers are training for, gaining knowledge of and are to serve (KD 2008: p. 148).

Increased attention to both the scope and quality of teacher education is due in part to a fast approaching generation shift among Norwegian teachers, in part to NOKUT’s evaluation of primary school teacher education, and in part due to the national and international test results that suggest that learning outcomes in the schools are not in accord with investments made.

In this text, we would like to argue for the importance of student teachers and teachers themselves developing competence about work in research and development (R and D) in order to counteract what Tiller characterises as the kangaroo school. In addition we will discuss teacher-student R and D work at NTNU (University of Trondheim), and experiences garnered through this work. But first we wish to discuss the research-based concept and, finally, to take up varying perspectives concerning teacher education.

**Research-based**

The role of educational research in areas such as policy and practise has been hotly debated (cf Hammersley, 2002, 2007; Haug, p. 211 and Kvernbekk, 2011). Here we would like to make use of Hammersley’s concepts of one-world theory and two-worlds theory (Hammersley, 2002) as ways of expressing the differing discourses regarding the dynamics of research, policy and practice.

The one-world theory describes research as integrated with practice or, perhaps better still, that research be done in the service of practice. Research-based knowledge is regarded as instrumental and technical, and such knowledge is to be used in a direct way to solve a problem. Hattie’s book *Visible Learning* (2009), which is highly regarded these
days, can serve as an example of research where numerous studies are gathered in an effort to find out what the most effective teaching would be like. Hattie compiles studies that say something about, for example, whether separate classes for boys and girls are more effective or whether small schools are the most efficient.

These studies draw conclusions based on functionality, and the claim is that studies about the examples mentioned above are value neutral, and thus ethical and political questions are not problematic. In other words, educational research can be used directly to prescribe practice (Haugen og Hestbek, 2012). In the world of policy this is referred to as “evidence-based knowledge about practise”. Haug (2003) claims that in Norwegian policy documents this is the prevailing attitude: he expresses concern about this attitude being used to legitimise political decisions, rather than to foster critical appraisal.

Evidence-based research programs thus gain in priority (Haug 2011) because the authorities to a greater degree than before favour certain research projects and through establishing an institution called Centre for Knowledge. In a follow-up to this Haug (2011a) claims that an international neo-liberal trend in education increases the pressure on Norwegian academia and schools to produce “useful” results in order to expedite the production of knowledge and learning.

In the two-worlds theory research is regarded as autonomous and concerned with seeking knowledge for its own sake (Hammersley, 2002). Research and practice belong in two different worlds, where research is seen first and foremost as a source of enlightenment. The two-worlds theory has its background in the classical division between theory and practice and is conditioned on their dissimilarities.

Practice belongs to the world of action while research creates generalized knowledge about experience, which is to say theories about phenomena as such. In the area of action, research is only one among several sources of knowledge that form the basis for insight, reflection and performance. Using research requires the additional use of informed opinion as well as requiring that information on the phenomenon be gathered from various sources.
This creates a basis that allows for fresh activities and efforts (Haug, 2003). In such a context, research like that referred to by Hattie (2009) (e.g. gender segregated classes and size of school) represents one type of knowledge, but cannot be considered as the one and only way in which to organize a school (Haugen og Hestbek, 2012). Research within the framework of a two-worlds theory will also take into account, for example, questions of values and power structure, and questions about how small schools help to preserve population stability in outlying areas, and how boys and girls ought to relate to each other in schools even though research-wise they may not be the most ‘efficient’ questions.

“Pursuing an activity necessarily involves making certain things thematic and leaving others as background, even if, as we have suggested, the boundary between theme and background may vary over time as a result of changes in relevancies”. (Hammersley, 2002: p. 69)

Hammersley (2007) points out that most people will find themselves somewhere between the two discourses. That means that research should contribute to knowledge for its own sake and at the same time make an impact on practice (Haugen og Hestbek, 2012).

**Perspectives in teacher education**

If one wishes to discuss positions regarding research-based knowledge in teacher training, it is first necessary to say something about what one thinks of as the purpose of teacher training. Hansen (2008) distinguishes among three different perspectives in teacher education.

Perspective 1: The school is to socialise young people into adjusting to the demands and expectations of society. Since student teachers themselves have been socialised by the school system, there is little need for a research-based teacher training since they already are in possession of ‘the code’ for how a school is run. This alternative in teacher education is first and foremost a program for learning the socialisation function of the existing system. This ensures continuity. An example of this view of teacher training can be found in England where Margaret Thatcher placed most teacher training inside the school and the student teacher learned from teachers (Arnfinsen, Hestbek & Ramberg 2010).
Perspective 2: Teachers are thought of as technicians and functionaries who basically ‘serve’ the interests of those who are possession of economic and political power. This means that teachers’ work is governed through bureaucratic and administrative controls (for example, standardised tests and ratings). Schools are subject to instrumental systems that hinder autonomous practise.

In terms of this perspective school development means managing the teachers and the school through, for example, evaluation and supervision. This attitude to the teaching profession is promoted by the OECD, among others, (Haugen, 2011a), and practices such as these are strongly represented in American schools. As far as the Norwegian school system is concerned, this perspective is gaining influence as exemplified by the use of national standardised tests and demands for the documentation of teacher work. Here basic research is tied to a one-world theory, where the most ‘efficient’ teacher training is sought after (Haugen og Hestbek, 2012). Research is linked to how policy guidelines can be most effectively implemented.

Perspective 3: The third and final perspective emphasises that the school should prepare for continuity as well as development. However, this perspective is based on the idea that the teacher should assume a more autonomous stance than in perspective 2. This entails that the teacher should legitimise present practices as well as work towards a better society. Both NOKUT (2008), OECD (2005) and the Norwegian government (St.meld 2009, p.11) emphasise this perspective by stressing that teacher education must be more focused on research, include R-and-D work and support lifelong learning.

Hansen (2008:12) argues that

“Teachers need to cultivate an articulate perspective on today’s rapidly changing world with its economic, social, technological, and environmental problems and prospects ... Unless teachers cultivate a sense of purpose allied with a feeling for the larger human affairs of our time, they may themselves feel solely like functionaries.”

This means that if teachers are to have a central role in the development of the school, it will be necessary that in addition to having knowledge and experience on how to teach, they also have a wider perspective and cognisance of the larger questions concerning
the school’s role and function in society. Such considerations will come from a two-worlds theory and will potentially be in collision with a one-world theory. In other words, a conflict may arise between these two theories when it comes to the function of research in teacher training (Haugen og Hestbek, 2012).

**Research based professional teacher education**

If teachers are to contribute both to continuity as well as change in the schools, teacher education must give start competence as well as competence in development and change (Hestbek, 2010b). This means that to a greater extent than before teacher education must be organised in such a way that student teachers gain experience in research and development tasks in order to systematically document both their own professional experience and the work of the school using research-based methods. This will again contribute towards generating autonomous teachers who themselves are able to make professional choices based on scholarship and experience.

One of the reasons that Finland can be said to have succeeded in terms of international quality goals in schools and education can be the clear, academic basis fundamental to their teacher education. Saarrommaa Hausstätter and Saarrommaa (2008) draw attention to the fact that Finnish schools today are to a great extent characterised by autonomous teachers who, to only a very limited extent, are subject to others (outside authorities), and who are, on the contrary, encouraged to take responsibility themselves for development in their schools (Østern og Hestbek, 2010). The authors maintain that knowledge about qualitative and quantitative research methods and scholarly reflection play a decisive role in the development and education of the autonomous and professional Finnish teacher.

At the same time challenges tied to a stronger academism in teacher education can also arise. The result can be a form of teacher training based too heavily on an academic discipline and only to a small degree on the teaching profession’s own premises. A one-sided emphasis on academic fundamentals in teacher training programs can lead to a fading away of the teaching profession’s normative goals (proficiency in work at school). On the other hand, professional education cannot merely rest on reflections about what good teaching means in its
various arenas; it demands scientific knowledge of the world, insight into the subject disciplines that form the basis of professional training, and the methods that bring forth that knowledge. In other words, the short training for the teaching profession must be founded on research-based knowledge as well as procedures that lead to good teaching practises (KD 2008, p. 148).

**Examples of R-and-D work for student teachers**

During the school year of 2006-2007 at NTNU obligatory R-and-D work was introduced for all student teachers organised around an evaluation of NTNU’s partnership model. R-and-D work was to give student teachers research and development competence tied to their teaching, student learning and socialization, and built upon a theoretical foundation in terms of research using data gathering methods and analytical tools. This competence was to create a basis for development of the individual teacher’s practice and practice-theory as well as for school development as a whole.

The theme of the students’ R-and D work was to be pupil evaluation with an emphasis on ongoing assessment. The grounds for the choice of this theme were the increasing national attention to this area, as well as research done showing that teachers have to a lesser degree an understanding of the criteria for evaluation and/or for comprehensive assessment practise.

This research work was also to give students competence in teamwork, which has steadily been gaining in importance for teachers’ work in schools. Of central importance to this competency would be the reaping of insights into one’s own role, into an understanding how one’s own behaviour influences groups, and into how oneself is influenced. The learning goals were the following: 1) increased understanding of and knowledge about principles for pupil assessment and for documentation of these pupil assessments, as well as an introduction into the theoretical basis for evaluation of learning and for learning. 2) increased understanding of and knowledge about R-and-D work, in addition to competence in carrying out systematic R-and-D work tied to practice teaching.
Student teachers work with R-and-D in groups of 2-4 students who are practising at the same partnering school and who preferably have the same subjects with in the same subject areas. Students can choose between two different methods for their R-and-D work.

A. Action learning including qualitative data gathering and analysis: Student teachers act within their own subject area (if the group has not already decided on an interdisciplinary project). The teaching goals for learners must be clearly presented. The various experiences (compiled as data) encountered during the project are then the subject of analysis and discussion in the groups.

B. Qualitative and/or quantitative planning and analysis. Groups choose a joint focus or problem area as the starting point for the R-and-D work. The groups use data gathering methods best for their approach to the problem. Research groups can gather data from one or more classes or groups.

At the end of the semester, the groups present their projects at an R-and-D conference before the final exam.

The outcome of this work is to be two documents: A project report and a process report. The reports must be founded on theory. The project report is to demonstrate the student teachers’ competence in their subject, their didactic competence, their pedagogic competence and their competence in change and development.

The process document is to demonstrate student teachers’ leadership, social and communicative abilities. The students are to describe their group process with a focus on the learning process, learning outcomes and group dynamics. Furthermore, the group are to reflect over their presentation/s at the R-and-D conference, centring on their presentation format, together with feedback from their fellow students and subject teachers.

For the conference the students are to prepare an oral presentation of their R-and-D project. The groups can use varying forms of expression such as Power Point, sound, pictures, narrative techniques, dramaturgy, music, song, dance and so on as aids to their presentation. All members of the group must take part in the
presentation. Their fellow students will use the opportunity to proffer critical comments in terms of specific criteria. The presentation will receive a pass/fail mark from the section leader in charge.

R-and-D work is a part of the final examination in didactics and pedagogy and is graded by teachers in each of these subjects in terms of specific criteria. A group grade is given.

Experience so far indicate that student teachers to a greater degree than previously are beginning to employ theory as a frame of reference for their practise, and that through R-and-D work are learning to make use of each other’s subject competence. (Grepperud, Hestbek and Ramberg, 2008). The students also see the value of cooperative efforts.

‘Through the R-and-D project we have gained a taste of what action research in school can be, the kind of methods we can start using and the value of interdisciplinary cooperation. We have seen that even small and simple projects have much to teach us. With this knowledge it will be easier to start up projects and contribute to school development when we start as teachers in school’ (Student Group at PPU 2006/07 in: Grepperud, Hestbek and Ramberg, 2008 s.1)

R-and-D competence is necessary not just for the development of individual teachers’ own practice, but also in order to be able to contribute to systematic development in the schools and to be able to make critical evaluations of educational policy decisions.

However, when it comes to recognizing and further developing the newly educated teachers’ competence in the schools where they begin to practise their profession, (Hestbek, 2010a) there is clearly plenty of room for improvement with reference to R-and-D. What can be said of R-and-D in Norwegian schools is, among other things, that there is little competence in this area among Norwegian teachers. Furthermore, there is neither any real culture for documenting school development work in written form, nor for participating in debates about educational policy.

But there are some bright spots. Through several projects initiated and financed by both The Norwegian Research Council and the Department of Education we can see that research and development
work has become a requirement—precisely in order to develop individual teachers’ and schools’ competence in systematic knowledge about their work and their profession. Perhaps our newly educated teachers can become an important resource in this particular work.

‘We can sum up the whole process around the R-and-D project in one expression: very instructive! In addition to learning our subject, we have learned incredibly much about structuring project work. The importance of having a good basis before you go further in a project is essential for later work. We have also had a wonderful experience participating in interdisciplinary work. Subject areas that seem at the start to have little in common, can work together pedagogically anyway, and achieve results that are fruitful for all our subjects.’ (Student group PPU 2006/07 in: Grepperud, Hestbek and Ramberg, 2008 s. 14).

Looking ahead

The pilot project outlined in this section is carried out within the larger, established program for teacher education at NTNU (Norwegian University of Science and Technology). The larger, overarching program is called The Master of the Teacher Profession and Teacher Practise (MTPTP) and was introduced in 2003. It represents an alternative to an older, traditional program for teacher training for the secondary school that has as its base a university degree, i.e. a purely academic discipline to which is added a short teacher training program.

The pilot project aims to answer two research questions: Will a community of practice based on personal development through scaffolding that challenges the individual stakeholder’s personal beliefs and teaching practise give way to professional growth? Will subject teaching based on a strong framework outlined in clear curricular structures: knowledge, skills and general competence, and a common underlying set of concepts: savoir, savoir-faire, savoir être and savoir apprendre (COE, 2001), constitute a fruitful foundation for developing subject teacher professionalism across institutional levels in French?

The long-term aim for this pilot project is to prepare the ground for the development of a systemic learning spiral where professional growth at the individual level constitutes the first pivot point within the MTPTP and the school subject at the organisational level.
constitutes the second pivot point. The third pivot point relates to general didactics at the institutional and national level.

The MTPTP program is an attempt to find an educational form that blends academic training with teacher training in an organic, seamless way. The pilot project outlined here falls into line with MTPTP, but takes its blend of academic input and teacher training a step further. It requires a much closer cooperation among a number of resource persons in several disciplines in an attempt to create an atmosphere of fruitful interplay between practise and theory.

Figure 1: Individual level (stakeholders)

This is to counteract the fact that students often see the university as predominantly theory based and the practise field as predominantly practise based. This dichotomy will prevail unless student teachers are invited to reflect upon highly complex educational matters in a theory-practice continuum (Barton og Shepherd, 2009, Iversen og Lorentzen, 2011) Likewise, mentors in school and academics at university level tend to view their disciplines as isolated domains, and are unlikely to see a bridge between their knowledge and other aspects of teacher training, unless they are invited to (Biesta, 2004, Langseth, 2010, Riksaasen, 2010, Sletbakk mfl., 2011).

The participants and their roles

The students that are involved in the pilot project are first year students of French language and culture. Their educational program is a five-year one, at the end of which they are certified as secondary school teachers.
In addition to the student (student teachers) the academic and school professional involved can be envisaged as shown in Figure 1. The purely academic input (French) will come from subject lecturers; the pedagogue will provide theoretical input; the mentor is the manager of the practical classroom situation and the subject didactics teacher is the one to bridge the gap between the pedagogue and the mentor. The student will provide feedback and documented learning outcomes. For all five stakeholders in this figure the model provides an opportunity for hands-on experience conducive to professional growth.

In a subject-teaching construct, the stakeholders involved can be envisaged as representatives of the various institutions as follows:

**Figure 2: Organisational level**

The purely academic input (French) will come from the instituts; the teacher training programme will provide general and subject didactics input; the schools will provide in-service training. The students will provide feedback through their student organisations. For all stakeholders in this figure the model provides an opportunity for an educational culture conducive to organisational growth.

School subjects are defined through their structure and coherence (Klafki, 2002). The Material side, which is related to Klafki’s concept of material bildung, safeguards the specific structure of the subject and what the teacher student should learn about the subject. The formal side, which is related to Klafki’s concept of formal bildung, safeguards
the subject in a larger context, as in what the student should learn from
the subject, in the perspective of socializing the teacher students into
society and future jobs.

In French, which is the subject chosen for this pilot, the subject
lecturers will develop the student’s knowledge and skills in French
language, literature and culture, which is related to material bildung.
The French didactics teacher and the mentors will develop the
student teacher’s teacher knowledge (Tsui, 2011) in foreign language
teaching through formal bildung.

The pedagogues will safeguard the teacher students’ development of
formal bildung in the subject in a larger context, in classroom
teaching, at school level and in society, as well as the emotional
aspects of learning. The researchers in this pilot project hypothesize
that the material bildung of the school subject precedes the
development of the formal bildung, which is even more complex.
There is, of course, a considerable amount of overlap between the
different approaches to subject teaching outlined above, hence the
need for an educational culture.

The researchers also hypothesize that subject based educational
cultures will be in a strong position to influence the long-term aims
and objectives of the MTPTP through evidence-based knowledge
(Hattie, 2009) and experience-based creativity.

There is no tradition of seeing the various institutions involved in
subject teaching as one single construct in Norway. The older model
as well as the MTPTP conceives of the institutions involved as
separate entities. Challenging this practice and, going farther still,
changing it, will amount to a paradigm shift in the educational sector.
The stakeholders who have embarked on this uncharted voyage will
need all the help and encouragement they can get.

A systemic approach to subject teaching

The Norwegian government will present a new framework for teacher
education at secondary level in 2013, based on the European
Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (EQF, 2008) which
has been agreed upon by the European institutions and the
Qualifications Framework in the European Higher Educational Area resulting from the Bologna process (Bologna, 2005). Consequently, all knowledge, skills and general competence curriculum goals in the MTPTP are defined in the form of "can-do" statements. This gives the pilot project a common curricular platform.

The researchers in the MTPTP believe that shared knowledge about the intended learning outcomes, as well as shared knowledge about student documented learning outcomes, will make the educational culture in the MTPTP more transparent and more open to transformative change over time. This entails discussing the value of intended learning outcomes in terms of what is desirable and what is undesirable as well as locating elements that might promote or impede high quality learning outcomes.

This also entails discussing possible learning processes related to learning strategies and actions such as writing, reading, talking, listening (COE, 2001, Biesta, 2004). The intended learning outcomes visualize the goals in subject teaching and the documented learning outcomes visualize the standards the students reach in tested areas. The two types of learning outcome form a learning spiral, going from basic to higher order thinking through reflection and action. It is of vital importance that the knowledge the students gain in the academic learning environments at university cognitively relates to the skills they develop while in-service, and that these support rather than conflict with each other. This curricular approach intends to give the teacher student an holistic understanding of the goals in subject teacher professionalism.

At the individual level, the common denominator is each stakeholder’s competences and his or her commitment to subject teaching as described in The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (COE, 2001):

- **Savoir** (declarative knowledge resulting from experience or from formal learning, socio-cultural knowledge, interpersonal awareness, academic knowledge, empirical knowledge)
• **Savoir-faire** (know-how, practical skills, ability to carry out procedures, facilitated by the acquisition of knowledge, intercultural skills and existential competence)
• **Savoir être** (existential competence, the sum of individual characteristics, personality traits, attitudes, motivation, beliefs, cognitive styles, view of others, willingness to engage with others in social interaction and attitude formation)
• **Savoir apprendre** (ability to learn, how to mobilise competences, declarative knowledge and skills, being disposed to discover “otherness” related to language, culture people and new areas of knowledge, learning strategies, study skills).

These *savoirs* constitute the basic concepts in the learning process that teacher students will undergo in their French studies. The individual level is vulnerable, because the weakest link might impede learning enhancing environments, be it the student, the mentor, the subject lecturer, the subject didactics teacher or the pedagogue.

However, this is also the level where personal creativity, with the potential to change educational policy making, is initiated. Ideally, each participant is met according to his or her individual needs and given possibilities for personal growth within his or her zone of proximal development (Vygotsky, 1978) while in the programme.

The stakeholders are scaffolders (Wood et al., 1976) in the students’ learning process. They model good practise, coach, challenge and give feedback on the students’ academic work and on their in-service teaching. At the same time, students are scaffolders in the stakeholders’ learning process through regular feedback on lectures and mentoring and through broader evaluation processes at the end of term.

Moreover, stakeholders are subject to professional scaffolding through guidance and collaboration beyond their own academic field. Scaffolding as a system enables the stakeholders to value and evaluate their own personal and social abilities in order not only to reproduce, but also to improve and create new teaching practises (Rust et al., 2003, Biesta, 2004). The idea being that a rising tide raises all the ships.
Teachers base their teaching on experience from being students, teaching and implicit or explicit theories about teaching (Rust mfl., 2003). Pedagogical paradigms, which are closely related to personal views about the art of teaching, might become an obstacle to collaboration (Turner-Bisset, 2001, Midtsundstad, 2010). Subject teaching can be envisaged as a practical activity, as in working with texts and exercises.

Also, subject teaching can be seen as a competence, as in mastering a set of teaching methods. It can be seen as an art, as in looking at texts in order to understand the world that surrounds us. Moreover, subject teaching can be seen as a craft, as in a way of mastering a craft or simply as applied academics, as in a light version of an academic study at school level.

Furthermore, subject teaching can be seen as a system, as in reaching a certain standard outlined in competence aims and assessment criteria. Finally, subject teaching can be seen as reflection, as in an on-going discussion about aims and objectives among teachers and students. Stakeholders have their personal preferences and these preferences colour the way they teach accordingly.

By establishing a community of practice in an educational culture, stakeholders are given the chance to challenge their personal views on learning, teaching and assessment (COE, 2001) in order to develop subject teaching professionalism.

Methodological approach

The pilot project makes use of several methodological approaches. Korthagen’s (Korthagen, 2001) ALACT model for reflective processes (Korthagen, 2001) constitutes the framework for the collective learning spiral in the pilot. The model consists of action, looking back on the action, awareness of essential aspects, the creation of alternative methods of action and trial. Another approach is based on Cooperative learning, which empowers all participants, and gives equal time for all stakeholders to express themselves on equal terms and to learn from each other, thus creating personal development through interpersonal awareness (Huber og Mompoint-Gaillard, 2011).
A third methodological approach is peer counselling, which opens up the lecture hall or the classroom for observation and trial followed by reflection between the teacher and the observer on equal terms. A last approach includes assessment for learning (Wiliam, 2010), which entails discussions about aims and objectives, how to close the gap between where the students are in their learning and where they are going. This approach also includes assessment. Fair assessment is only obtained through a shared practise where standards are discussed regularly (Sadler, 2005).

**Organisational approach**

A systemic approach requires a certain amount of cooperation. The stakeholders must have time to work, experience and learn together both digitally and face-to-face over time. The pilot project operates in various learning arenas, where some or all participants cooperate depending upon the nature of the competence to be developed. Several arenas are available in the pilot project.

**Meetings**: Cooperation takes place through face-to-face meeting between the subject didactics teacher, the pedagoge, the subject lecturers and the school mentor.

**Peer counselling**: The stakeholders observe each other while teaching followed by a reflective dialogue.

**Mentoring**: Mentors let students in to their classroom where they model teaching and students try out their own ideas when teaching, supervised by the mentor. Mentoring might also apply to other stakeholders.

**Classroom visit**: The didactics teacher visits the student’s classroom. The didactics teacher and the mentor observe the student while teaching and evaluate the lesson together with the student afterwards.

**Reflective dialogues**: The students develop a teacher student profile where they describe their own goals and experiences as student teachers. The teacher trainers and mentors use this profile in regular dialogues with the student.

**Academic writing**: Teacher students write academic papers in their teaching subject during the programme. Every student is given personal feedback, once from a fellow student and once from the lecturer half way in the writing process.

**Academic presentation and dialogue**: Teacher students give an academic lecture, answer following-up questions and get feedback from fellow students.
**Research and enquiry:** Students form teams where they define themselves as researchers and share their findings at a local student conference before they hand in their enquiry. Some students are asked to develop their enquiry into a public research paper published at university level or elsewhere.

**Digital portfolio:** A digital learning environment gives stakeholders access to the student’s work during the whole learning progress. Hence, it is possible to identify his or her individual knowledge and methods of learning digitally and to scaffold his or her learning according to individual needs both face-to-face and digitally.

**Social networking:** Social networking is used to discuss didactics and subject related topics informally, as they arise, during the whole programme. Facebook might be a suitable application.

**Evaluation and assessment:** By the end of term, all stakeholders, including teacher students meet in order to evaluate subject teaching in the MTPTP. This meeting is prepared by an elected group of subject teacher student representatives whose responsibility is to inform the stakeholders about possible obstacles to the students’ learning process during the whole programme. Stakeholders are equally given the opportunity to voice their experiences in the meeting.

As mentioned previously in this chapter, the Norwegian school can be described as a kangaroo school, jumping along with no direction. This pilot project empowers the teachers on their road to professional autonomy through his or her knowledge about learning and professional development. The researchers in this pilot project do not want to create an educational system adopting the standard food of McDonald’s, where everybody gets the same wherever they are in the world. Rather, we are looking for the variety and quality to be found in the Michelin Guide, where creativity and originality is the driving factor.
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Chapter 9: School Improvement: Innovation for the Future
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The current educational environment in Australia is exerting considerable pressure on schools to raise the level of student achievement. There have been pressures placed on schools to be both more efficient and accountable in meeting the needs of each student. In Australia, this is evidenced through a national student reporting system, the movement towards development of a national curriculum and the establishment of the Federal government’s “Myschool Website”.

Aligned with the challenges on how to improve schools is the long-term challenge of sustaining any improvement. The call for sustainability, which depends upon a school’s internal capacity to maintain and support the work of teachers, is gathering momentum and is achieved through capacity building and preparing teachers themselves to lead innovation and development. This supports the inference that, in focusing on learning, the significant role of leadership distribution is in generating and sustaining improvement in schools.

Sustaining school improvement requires engaging the leadership capacity of many staff members in the school. This is in contrast to the traditional view of leadership where only a few appointed people lead (or manage the work of those below them). In developing leadership capacity, not only is there anecdotal evidence that specific factors are necessary (e.g. time, trust, risk taking) but that success is tied to the contributions and level of support given by the principal. Consequently fostering a positive teacher efficacy is foundational to building leadership capacity throughout the school.
With the Federal Government’s $14.7 billion package for schools to implement new building and refurbishments programs for their schools, it is imperative that the leadership within schools focus on providing, not only the physical learning spaces to support our students and teachers in becoming 21st century learners, but also on the essential pedagogy to effectively meet the needs of the new generation of learners. Moreover there is a need to engage strategies that enhance teacher ability to improve results.

This chapter explains our school’s approach to implementing curriculum change to meet a growing conceptualisation in Australia of learning in and for the 21st century. Through recounting a series of planned strategic events, it highlights the benefits of consultative practices and articulates the importance of engaging the role of distributive leadership as a key element for fostering school improvement.

**Reason for Change at St Augustine’s Primary School**

The design of schools is changing as our understanding develops of not only how children learn best but also in what environment do they best learn. Schools are shifting from teaching institutions to learning organisations through increased connectivity between students and their local and global environments. In particular, knowledge is increasingly being explored across disciplines rather than isolated within subjects. Environmental imperatives, changing methods in teaching and learning and the impact of the digital age each have implications for the physical facilities and learning spaces. The traditional classroom, with students working in rows of desks facing the teacher at the front of the room copying page after page from the board, is no longer the best learning environment for our students today.

With the key premise of preparing students for a changing world together with the worldwide access to information technology, schools have an overwhelming responsibility to enable students to
locate, evaluate and use information to live and work in the 21st century (Treadwell, 2008). Indeed, technology has to serve sound pedagogy with in our schools. How schools prepare students for the new century is undergoing a robust debate across the world.

Building a school that caters for new paradigms is not a simple task. Different conceptions, viewpoints and opinions, based upon one’s experience and/or subject expertise can complicate and even derail discussion. Everyone has an opinion. Developing a common image of the 21st century school is a key strategy for progressing the conversation on schooling in the 21st century (Beare, 2006) thus improving the knowledge in this area. Changing the current teaching experience will help support a change in how a teacher views learning.

For Mark Treadwell education in the 21st Century is personalized, focusing on creativity and innovation. Schools need to inculcate skills, which will allow students to become people:

… who have wisdom, not just people who are intelligent but people who have the capability, the passion and the desire to continue to learn and to contribute to the global knowledge-base using a wide range of media throughout their entire lives in a manner that we would consider wise (Treadwell, 2008, p. 9).

For schools to be relevant for the 21st Century, recent research has revealed that they need to become knowledge generating (Beare, 2001; Senge, 1994) and that leadership is central to attaining the ideal. For this to occur professional learning needs to take on a more focused resolve amongst teachers and school leaders. Otherwise education and student learning may follow the old adage “if we always do what we’ve always done, we’ll always get what we’ve already got”. Our understanding of learning today points more towards the view that: “what got us to where we are won’t get us to where we’re going”. It is important to note that this changing viewpoint is not an individual task but a collaborative endeavour.
This particular conception arose when, as a newly appointed principal, I began to review the results of our school’s standardised tests in Years Three and Five over a ten year period (i.e. the Basic Skills Tests which are now replaced by NAPLAN). In short, while results were high (above state and diocesan averages) the graph was horizontal. The hard work put in by staff over the years kept the learning on an even keel. Through some strategic staff professional development activities (explored later) including studying some contemporary literature, the question staff began to ask was simply; “What difference are we making if all we are doing is keeping the learning curve level?” It was the unpacking of this profound question that began the “new learning journey for St Augustine’s”

How we live is changing

We know that education has changed. It is quite clear that our students are coming to school with different skills and experiences that we as parents had when we first started school. Yet many parents’ expectations (and indeed some staff) reason that the school experience for our children should replicate that of their own schooling. As the message expressed in many academic arenas highlight, the scenario of a row of students with the teacher out the front preaching to the class does not cater for how our students learn today.

This is exactly the message that underpinned our community’s development of our strategic plan. The community members saw our current era of schooling as being defined as learning for living in the 21st century and observed that our students are growing up in a digital era. Economic, technological, informational, demographic and political forces have transformed the way people work and live. These changes, and the rate of change, will continue to accelerate. Schools, like businesses, communities and families, must adapt to changing conditions to thrive.
It was felt that our school would face irrelevance unless we bridged the gap between how students live and how they learn. Students will spend their adult lives in a multitasking, multifaceted, they will be technologically driven, work in a diverse and vibrant world – and they must arrive equipped to do so.

**Strategic Planning**

Early in 2008 our school community undertook a comprehensive school review and development program where our focus on learning was accentuated. Our parents, through surveys and informative discussion groups expressed that they wanted our students to have diverse learning opportunities, to be at the forefront of information and communications technology and to continue to aim high in academic standards.

As stated earlier “nothing changes if nothing changes”. Furthermore “if we keep doing what we've always done, we'll only get what we’ve always got.” Our students are changing and we have a professional responsibility to change with them. This was the central message from the School Review and Development program. The culmination of the SRD was the formation of our 2009-2013 strategic plan.

Our strategic plan clearly articulates a vision for learning in the 21st century. Providing flexible learning environments conducive to fostering 21st century learning is an expectation that our parents are placing upon us. However, knowing that the learning environment that we grew up with (ie, sitting in rows facing the teacher, not daring to ask questions, doing exactly what the student next to me is doing whether it was too easy or too difficult, seek clarification or even think for ourselves) needs to change to meet the needs of a new learning era, deciding on what the classroom of the future should look like is the challenge.
Our strategic plan highlighted 7 key themes:

1. 21st Century Thinking
2. Improvement of School Facilities
3. Supporting Families
4. Social/Emotional Development
5. Early Years
6. Environmental Awareness
7. Engaging Technology

Our key focus is on student learning (i.e. improving student outcomes) and that our current children are growing up in a digital world. These 21st century students are engaged with many digital devices and as technology rapidly evolves more and more new learning is introduced and like each parent of children growing up today our staff want the best for them.

**Philosophy for Learning**

Consequently, what’s happening inside our classrooms is changing – dramatically. With the focus on learning everything we do should support quality learning for all students. This is evident through the provision of staff, teaching resources, curriculum plans, furniture, technology, timetables and professional development opportunities. Our first task was to develop a whole school vision for learning.

As part of the school’s five yearly quality assurance program, School Review & Development, a comprehensive audit of curriculum practices and results was held. Together with a large whole school consultative process the formulation of a five-year strategic plan was developed. This involved the community looking at the mission and purpose of the school. From this foundation the community articulated a specific vision for a preferred future.
The implementation of this vision involved a number of key pathways with the single biggest factor being the teacher. Acknowledging the literature on the importance of quality teaching as the biggest factor in raising student achievement, supporting teacher improvement was identified as a key issue for staff. Developing an understanding of learning in the 21st century was an obvious starting point with building on an early initiative of establishing PEEL (Project for Enhancing Effective Learning) strategies across the curriculum a major focus. This approach was seen as central to the new learning vision of 21st century thinking and learning.

Recognizing the changing nature of student learning today and the influence of the digital revolution, the need to engage students in their “out of school learning context” became evident. This acknowledgement is problematic from the stance of understanding what the learning context should look like. For most staff it was difficult to conceptualize the practical aspect of the teaching/learning cycle in terms of physical layout and daily functionality of the classroom environment.

Our vision for learning is to make it personalized and to making learning relevant to each child. Our delivery is to move from a teacher centred focus to student focused learning. This ensures that the dominant factor in the classroom is the learning not the teaching (or teacher) and most importantly this targets the needs of each individual student. This is not to say the teacher is secondary to learning but rather the learning is supported by quality teaching practices devised and orchestrated by the teacher.

With the key premise of preparing students for a changing world we have to let go of past practices and recognize the obligation of all teachers to be relevant today. We need to shut down the factory model to move towards a deep learning model. Children disengage from learning when we don’t meet their learning needs. As Sir Ken Robinson (2010) says, “Feed their Spirit”. We aim to engage (feed) our students through the effective pedagogies of the 21st century.
Our vision for learning:

- involves more focused teaching strategies and more interesting learning spaces for all children
- means creating a school that young people enjoy and where they engage fully in their own learning.
- is for an adaptable space for students to move around in; more flexible time rather than the restrictions of a tight timetable; access to the internet and web 2.0 tools; teachers who can collaborate with and engage young people rather than simply manage them; sustains a more integrated curriculum.
- is where teachers and students work collaboratively to maximise learning.

So if this is our vision what does learning look like in this digital era and what is St Augustine’s doing about it?

**Professional Learning**

Establishing a new vision for learning led us to the next key task. Through formal staff discussion opportunities and the resultant ripple effect of conversation, the linking of technology with effective teaching strategies was seen as an area for development. Consequently a discussion on effective professional learning ensued. By investing considerable time and resources into the new leadership personnel whole school change through professional learning became possible.

Leading professional development and working with staff to enhance school productivity is a central component of the role of a leader. Supporting the staff learning culture is critical to becoming a professional learning community. Teachers, however, often need a considerable amount of guidance to learn how to implement school based planning in their classrooms. They may need guidance not only on how to teach but also on how to assess students’ progress. Helping teachers develop these crucial skills usually requires more than a one-day in service. Teacher reflection, multi-day workshops or longer-term arrangements with outside professionals may also be
required. Teachers need to engage in continuous improvement and develop a collective responsibility for professional improvement.

In fact, in my experience, many school leaders have found that professional development is more effective when it is delivered through teacher study groups (or professional learning communities). Accomplishing this, however, often requires rethinking organizational structures and soliciting support from other agencies to create opportunities for teachers to work together (Madden, 2007).

Fortunately we have a motivated staff and through providing extensive professional development pathways they have visited schools that are excelling in innovative learning, they have read current educational research and have participated in workshops with leading scholars from around the world. They, like our students, are life long learners and are always looking to ensure best practice is taking place in our classrooms. They have embraced our strategic plan and the framework of 21st century learning with great enthusiasm.

To begin the process, in 2008 and 2009 a number of key professional development opportunities were provided for staff. These included the leadership team and staff working with Mark Treadwell, staff attending various inservices including John Joseph (Brain Man) and Dr Ross Todd (Guided Inquiry). Staff were afforded professional development opportunities via iPods loaded with movie/video presentations by leading academics and practitioners in this field, in particular, Stephen Heppell (Learning Spaces), Sir Ken Robinson (Creativity) and various schools, both national and international, showcasing the use of technology and 21st century learning. The use of the iPods allowed staff to attend to their professional learning at their leisure. Each of these opportunities were critiqued and deliberated on during our weekly staff professional development sessions.

The purpose of providing such targeted professional development opportunities was to contextualise the place of learning as we enter a
new era of education at St Augustine’s. Literature is illustrating a movement from the knowledge era into the learning era. Staff need to have an understanding of what it means to be a teacher in the 21st century in order to commit to it.

**Focusing on the Student**

For St Augustine’s, engaging students in their learning means moving from a teacher centred model to a student centred model. As the research highlights a student engaged in his/her learning not only improves academically but also behaviourally and socially. This is the central element of our curriculum planning.

Underpinning the delivery of the new Australian Curriculum is inquiry-based learning. With this in mind staff meetings involving the whole teaching staff evolved into fortnightly Professional Development sessions with Cohort Team meetings occurring on alternate weeks. A specialized professional development afternoon was held each Wednesday afternoon designed to meet the individual needs (and wants) of staff. These ICT sessions (including web 2.0 technologies) enabled staff to develop new skills, which in turn engaged students more effectively in their learning. This collegial approach engendered strong ownership of learning tasks not only within the cohort of students but within the teaching staff as well.

The key purposes of this professional learning strategy were to:

- engage staff in professional dialogue about learning
- promote a collaborative approach to addressing specific skill development
- focus on key terminology across the school

By dialoguing with staff we were able to foster interest in the learning cycle, be able to focus teacher ‘talk’ on the student and to develop a common pathway to raising student achievement.
What does it look like? What skills do the students have? How do we manage their learning? What are the obstacles/challenges?

We aim to provide flexible pathways through the learning of Literacy and Numeracy fundamentals. Because each child learns differently, we are doing away with some of the traditional teaching/learning structures that can often hinder the rate of progress for children. The aim is to continually reflect on the nature of each learner; to use the data gathered through formal assessment and observation and to group students within their cohort, according to their needs.

In Numeracy and Literacy, this means that the children have the opportunity to work at a level that matches their ability in the different areas of content. For teachers, it means knowing students more intimately, and using different strategies and tools to guide each learner to the next level of understanding or skill. Children work more productively when the learning strategies are embedded in the right learning environment.

Much discussion has occurred on the need to build 21st century skills. We want students to be critical thinkers, problem solvers, to communicate effectively, be able to interact and collaborate, contribute informed opinions and be able to express their thoughts and ideas creatively. For these competencies to be integrally taught each day then our delivery of teaching and learning needs to change. Consequently, over the past few years we have been working as year level (cohort) teams where each teacher on the grade jointly shares in the decision making about each child’s learning.

In each year level, specialists from our Learning Support team work alongside teachers, particularly in the focus areas of Numeracy & Literacy, to cater for the range of differences that we find in our students – differences in interest, ability, learning style and motivation, just to name a few. The co-ordination of these programs is shared by our Learning Support Specialists, each of whom plays an
active role in the learning spaces, working alongside students and planning with teachers. It is these structures and our commitment to making a difference for each learner that really set our learning programs apart.

We have moved from a teacher-dominated classroom to a student centred learning environment. In doing so much attention has been toward not only embedding data layers of evidence to improve student outcomes but more significantly matching the learning strategies to individual learning needs.

**Learning Spaces**

Simultaneously with developing a greater understanding of how children learn we needed to look at the environment our children were learning in. Such rigorous discussions around pedagogy necessitated a focus on the spaces where learning was taking place.

Building on our shared understandings gained from our professional development activities over the past four years including Stephen Heppell’s research into the flexible learning environments, we are changing existing classrooms from a factory model of instruction to a more flexible learning settings. Our learning structures are changing to foster higher engagement in learning tasks.

As a staff we were adamant that the learning activities determine the physical space required. Our changing pedagogies force the realignment of the traditional classroom layout. We have seen a positive transformation in philosophy and pedagogy. Many classrooms now reflect this.

We are reconceptualising and redesigning learning spaces. It’s not simply about shifting furniture or painting walls but looking at how we fundamentally strengthen relationships within those learning spaces. We believe the physical environment has become the third teacher. Uncomfortable children often become disengaged children.
**How Did We Do It?**

There have been a number of key strategies implemented over the past few years in order to facilitate the cultural changes needed to not only engage staff in the change process but also to ensure sustainability. These initiatives were:

1. **School Leadership Team**

   A key facet that has had significant impact on changing the direction at St Augustine’s has been the restructure of the leadership team. The executive of the school had remained static over a number of years and it is fair to say that the nature of school life (routines and procedures) was grounded in the dynamics of that particular group. With the appointment of a new principal and a quick succession of retirements a notable change occurred. Through default, this change in leadership at the school seemingly supports the notion raised by Fullan as a key strategy for improving schools. In a 2006 report by the National Audit Office, London the number one strategy for turning around a failing school was to improve the school leadership (National Audit Office, 2006). The report states:

   Without an effective head teacher, a school is unlikely to have a culture of high expectations, or strive for continuous improvement (National Audit Office, 2006, p.9).

   In most cases this saw the removal of the head teacher (principal). While not a failing school, the change in the St Augustine’s school leadership hastened the discussion on moving to a 21st century teaching and learning framework. This change occurred over a short time and included two key actions.

   a. **Name Change**: A subtle name change from school executive to leadership team highlights a different emphasis on the role of the designated leaders in the school. Most teachers and ancillary staff are longterm employees whose conception of members of the executive was based on the notion of the expert teacher. Each
executive teacher supervised a particular Key Learning Areas (KLA).

b. Change of Personnel: With the retirement of long term key leaders a number of new formalized leadership roles were established. The move from an expert teacher position to a service oriented position provided a particular nuance which laid the platform for change.

2. Putting the Strategic Plan into Action

The release of the Federal Government’s BER program provided a major injection of funds to help supplement the building of learning spaces within schools. With the underlying premise that schools were to be refurbished to meet the demands of 21st century learning it was expected that schools will leave 20th century thinking behind. Unfortunately, the severe lack of time for serious discussion on what 21st century teaching and learning looks like has inhibited planning in some schools. One of the key recommendations from the commonwealths BER Report states:

The Taskforce’s school visitation program, design quality review and value for money analysis suggests that the best design and education outcomes are achieved through consultation (Australian Government, 2011, p.74).

The implementation timeframes of the stimulus package meant in some schools proper discussion on ‘learning in a contemporary world’ was non-existent and didn’t influence the building program.

However, for our school the priority for the BER focused on three areas; a 21st century library; new administration centre and three new-year level learning spaces. We were able to articulate our educational philosophy and translate that to the building plans and then into the bricks and mortar spaces that will enhance learning for our students today and well into the future.

As our staff were already engaged in dialogue on meeting the needs of the 21st century learner the physical construction of the BER program ensured the learning spaces were suitable for the new pedagogies we
were employing. The catalyst for staff discussion about these new pedagogies at St Augustine’s emanated not only from our school review program but also from spirited discussion within our Year Level meetings. These meetings were carefully facilitated to help key staff members come to terms with the physical learning environment for the 21st Century.

3. School Visitations

A key professional develop opportunity to engage staff in thinking about the change we wanted to bring to our school was the participation in school visits. The initial visitations began in 2008 when, our assistant principal, curriculum co-ordinator and myself participated in school visitations within the Parramatta and Canberra/Goulburn dioceses. The purpose was simply to look at what innovative schools were doing to address the learning needs of the 21st century learner. Our findings from this ‘road trip’ were presented to staff.

Following this initial experience teaching staff were subsequently engaged in the visitation program. In visiting other schools that had already undertaken major refurbishment as a step towards addressing learning in the 21st century our staff saw first hand schools working towards changing traditional teaching practices. As a result of this experience visiting teachers became more personally engaged in the discussion and engaged other staff in the conversation. Subsequent presentations outlined the examples from other schools to the whole staff and fostered lengthy discussions on our own school’s physical structures. The need for building flexible learning spaces to support the proposed new curriculum structure of the school was a key theme of these discussions.

4. Satellite Programs

When attempting to construct a significant culture change within a school it is noted that gaining acceptance of the need and
consequently the desire to change is often an obstacle for leaders to overcome. Teachers need to be enticed to invest their time and effort in order to effect such change. They have to find personal meaning in the task before true commitment is gained (Madden, 2007). Working with key personnel, particularly those most likely to drive change, was a key strategy in fostering the new vision for the school.

Satellite projects emerged while working with key staff on the “how to do it”. Such projects helped to initiate the practical implementation of the new curriculum framework. As a consequence of the above conversations the following satellite projects arose:

a. Cohort Timetables: An initial step was to amalgamate separate class timetables into one single cohort structure. It was perceived that to work effectively as a cohort where students can interchange between classes depending upon the learning tasks the administration of a single timetable facilitated organisation.

b. Guided Inquiry: Discussion on sharing intellectual control with students led to the need to engage in a teaching/learning process that nurtured deep learning, deep knowledge and deep understanding. A constructivist approach was promoted to facilitate active engagement, build on prior knowledge and enable the teacher to stage and guide learning new curriculum units of work.

c. Learning Spaces: In the move towards a personalized learning framework, the need to create specific learning spaces to facilitate specific teaching strategies was problematic. With a co-operative learning plan and the incorporation of a guided inquiry platform for learning, the move from student owned desks to flexible furniture was necessary.

d. Utilisation of Web 2.0 tools: With the Web 2.0 phenomenon already embedded into student lives it is incumbent upon teachers to “tap into their world” and use the technology for learning not just entertainment. Engaging the Web 2.0 tools to promote critical thinking also enables schooling to continue outside school hours. Building an online learning environment is evolving as teachers see the advantages of online management systems (e.g. moodle).

e. Inclusion of Digital Learning Devices: A quick analysis of entertainment devices used by students at home provided staff
with a starting point for engaging technology in their classrooms. 
IPods, digital cameras, mobile phones, X-boxes and Nintendo 
Wii are common in households. The use of web cams, msn chat 
rooms and common social networks (e.g. Facebook, Twitter,) is 
growing. Consequently, as part of the classroom fabric, teachers 
are experimenting with such devices for learning.

Building the satellite projects on site enabled staff to discuss the 
related organisational issues and constraints, experiment with ideas 
and trial new teaching/learning strategies. The resultant discussion 
provided a basis for ongoing professional development as staff 
collectively worked on moving the teaching/learning program into 
the 21st century.

5. Hattie’s Top Ten Strategies

An ‘aha’ moment presented itself when our professional learning 
critiqued John Hattie’s book, “Visible Learning”. In the top ten 
influences on student achievement the student was responsible for 
the top two. The following eight were the domain of the school, 
teacher and the art of teaching.

Hattie illustrates through his meta-analysis research evidence that the 
“biggest effects on student learning occur when teachers become 
learners of their own teaching, and when students become their own 
teachers” (Hattie, 2009). This allows students to show self-regulatory 
attributes that are most desirable for learners, such as self-monitoring, 
self-evaluation, self-assessment, and self-teaching. This being the case 
the big question for our staff was “How do we put such evidence into 
practice at our school?” If Hattie argues that teachers need to seek 
feedback on their teaching practices from colleagues and from 
students, what processes do we need to establish to make it a reality.

It was found that the move to cohort learning spaces allows for 
teachers to teach in shared spaces opening up the opportunity for 
dialogue on performance between cohort teachers (Madden, et. al,
2011). Hattie’s premise is that “teachers do matter” and with a focus on improving teacher practice we improve student achievement.

6. Engaging Technology

There is no doubt that advances in technology and the inter-relationship with the Internet is revolutionising how we do business in today’s society. Add this to the growing phenomenon that students are entering school with a different skill set. Research into Internet usage (Thomas, Ewing, & Schiessl, 2008), including our school’s parent and student technology surveys in 2010, illustrates the belief that the Internet for the “Net Generation” plays an essential part in their daily life.

Today’s student uses the Internet for a variety of purposes (e.g. gaming, gathering news and information, shopping, and communicating). The dependence on technology to deliver immediate feedback is pronounced. With students using the Internet regularly to communicate (via social networking sites) it highlights the intrinsic need of students to connect with each other. This opposes the view that using the computer alienates social development. Such research highlights that the social directions of the developing “Net Generation” are changing.

This being the case, rather than trying to control student behaviour by banning the tools our students use outside of school hours it would appear to be more prudent in trying to educate ourselves on this technology in order to teach with it and learn how to use it ethically. The digital age is re-defining education. As technology changes our culture and impacts upon all areas of our life, it is fair to say that schools need to reconsider the use of technology in providing relevant and meaningful teaching/learning experiences.

Our local Catholic high school, John Paul College has embarked upon a one to one laptop program beginning with Year Seven. This implementation strategy for the Commonwealth’s Digital Education
Revolution funding has significant implications upon our school. These devices are internet ready and are the property of the individual student. When students leave Year Six at St Augustine’s and engage in the new Year Seven learning framework at John Paul College, we want them to be capable and ready for the tasks ahead.

One of the greatest tasks for parents and staff in this rapidly evolving technological era is the ethical and moral use of the Internet. As our students become more and more reliant on the Internet, particularly from a personal perspective outside of school, it is important that they will make appropriate choices.

Given the uptake in Internet usage and the need to provide a student centred learning environment, the launch of our school’s KnowledgeNET in 2010 was not only timely but also aided our contemporary learning directions through providing the platform for engaging the 21st century pedagogies. This student learning management system is as much about supporting the teaching of appropriate Internet usage as it is about the very nature of learning.

KnowledgeNET is an initiative put into our school to meet the needs of the 21st century learner and to support greater engagement in student learning, staff planning and parental involvement in our school. It facilitates our move towards students self-reporting (noted earlier as Hattie’s number one influence on achievement). Functionality of the program enables students to share their learning with others (including parents and family members), receive feedback on their learning and aids the tracking of student achievement.

Furthermore, our KnowledgeNET allows us to foster our responsibility to help develop appropriate Internet usage through modeling ethical use of online activities. The system allows many of the functionality that students would use as a matter of course in their personal lives (i.e. emailing, text messaging, responding to and conducting polls and surveys, surf targeted websites, uploading documents and diary writing/blogging). Through the
KnowledgeNET we are able to explicitly teach the skills, values and attitudes that students need when they access the Internet at home for personal purposes. Effectively it is a closed (password protected) student learning management system.

The final hurdle to overcome is the integration of mobile technology in the school. The use of iPods, iPads, digital tablets and notebooks by students at home have placed pressure on our school to provide opportunities for educational use within school hours.

7. The Extended Role of the Library

With the development of Inquiry Based learning in our school, as part of the 21st century framework, it was essential to reassess the function of the library and the way in which it supports teachers in their role as a classroom teacher. The notion of guided inquiry nestles neatly into the new St Augustine’s learning philosophy:

Guided Inquiry offers an integrated unit of inquiry planned and guided by an instructional team of a school librarian and teachers, together allowing students to gain deeper understandings of subject area curriculum content and information literacy concepts. It combines often overlooked outside resources with materials in the school library. The team guides students toward developing skills and abilities necessary for the workplace and daily living in the rapidly changing information environment of the 21st century. (Kuhlthau et al, 2007, p. 1)

With information literacy and inquiry learning now key elements of new syllabuses it is incumbent upon each school community to weave such elements into their own teaching and learning infrastructure. However, historically the provision of school library lessons at St Augustine’s centred on the need to provide release from face to face for classroom teachers. Unlike teacher librarians in high school, the primary school equivalent follows a different pathway. The use of the librarian to provide release for teachers thwarted opportunity to integrate library lessons with classroom learning. Weekly lessons in isolation cannot meet the needs of a 21st century learning community.
Research tells us that teacher librarians have a vital role to play in planning, promoting, integrating and supporting teachers in the teaching/learning process but their role is inhibited when being tied to the release from face to face program (Combes, 2008).

Consequently, with St Augustine’s using the library personnel to provide release from face to face, the scheduling of groups of students to use the library was problematic. With over twenty-three class groups visiting the library each week there was virtually no vacant library space for classes to use outside their specialised library lesson.

With a need for resources in teaching and learning and the opportunity provided by the Building the Education Revolution, the idea of a localized resource centre for each cohort block was pursued but the concept was replaced with the construction of the new Library and Resource Centre (LARC). After much discussion the building of a specific learning space to house resources enables a hybrid approach to learning. Students in K-2 are using the LARC for specialist library based lessons as means to introduce and build on the various functions of the new facility. Years 3-6 access to the LARC focuses directly on research and inquiry based learning strategies.

With our teaching and learning philosophy supporting the ‘just in time’ learning model for meeting the personalize learning of students, the role of the LARC enables creative use of space and allows for more diversity in the teaching/learning cycle.

8. Collaborative Learning Pedagogy

Currently, as educators, our major problem is that we are holding onto a view of schooling that is still entrenched in the industrial age. This era valued memorisation of facts, where standardised testing was the key measure of success and the use of technology was for entertainment and social purposes only (Treadwell, 2008). The challenge for teachers today is to engage students in relevant and
meaningful learning experiences. These need to be challenging and ‘hands on’. For this to occur a rethinking of our curriculum is necessary as is the effective pedagogical delivery of learning experiences.

The current focus on establishing flexible learning environments conducive to 21st century learning is at the forefront of both political and educational authorities, and in particularly here at St Augustine’s. With students actively engaged in new technologies it is imperative that technology education and the fostering of competence be strongly embraced by our teachers. Skills needed for the workforce our students will be entering into, while building on the core basics of literacy and numeracy, are integrally linked to strong interpersonal skills. To achieve this students must engage in the real world and becoming active learners, not passive.

Students at St Augustine’s are learning in flexible learning spaces with all classes in the same grade. As noted earlier the teachers in the grade have weekly meetings to plan, implement, assess and evaluate learning and teaching for their grade. The students are grouped in various ways for different purposes depending on the targeted learning needs. Differentiating student learning involves dividing the grade into small groups according to learning needs (Tomlinson, 2000). This could include: learning support groups, core grade groups and interest based groups, individual learning, friendship groups, whole grade groups and collaborative Learning Project Groups.

In providing a differentiated philosophy classroom space usage now reflects various purposes for learning and teaching. Learning spaces are mapped out to allow for individual, group and class learning and teaching. Modern tables, chairs and dividers are organised into groups and used for inquiry based learning sessions. Different learning spaces allows for different learning activities. For example an interschool collaborative practice may allow a small Year 5 group to have a Skype debate with a group in a Scottish based school entitled, 'The Eureka Stockade was a defining moment in Australian history'.
Together with inquiry based learning being purported the key tool of 21st century learning (Kuhlthau et al., 2007) and that students learn more from their peers than from their teacher (Hattie, 2009) the implementation of cooperative and collaborative learning is a predominate strategy to be used at St Augustine’s. It helps develop comprehension, interpersonal skills, co-operation while addressing the key competencies (Tomlinson, 2000). Furthermore, it is through the peer-to-peer learning strategy we aim to promote good learning behaviours – recognising how well you work with others – choosing partners wisely is an important learning tool. A hidden outcome of learning in such spaces helps to teach the children how to operate respectfully in groups (Madden et. al., 2011).

Consequently supporting the peer-to-peer learning strategy has been the reorganisation of the physical nature of all our classrooms. It was imperative to resource the learning environment accordingly and as such the students now have easy access to IWBs; laptops; digital cameras; video cameras; ipod and scanners to support their learning.

9. Building Home – School Networks

There is a wealth of literature (Hattie, 2009) highlighting increased student performance is linked to engaged family involvement in school. Consequently, providing opportunity for parents to work with their children at home on school related tasks was initially centred on homework. This traditional method of communicating with parents, although limiting in terms of being up to date with student learning, was widely accepted by both staff and parents at our school.

Through staff professional learning on the tools needed for 21st century learning, some staff began engaging with a 24/7 model of learning within their classrooms. The use of the Internet together with inquiry based units of work saw students being engaged both in the classroom and out of schools hours. At home, students were able to “take up where they left off in class”. Because students can upload documents they have immediate access to their work. This means that
not only can homework sheets be emailed to students but also access to learning at school through the school’s student learning management system, KnoweldgeNET, is an option.

The consequence of such a process enables parents the opportunity to observe student learning first hand. As no assessment tasks are completed at home, parents are able to engage in the learning process without the teacher fear of parents “doing it” for their children. This initiative has seen more students engaged in their learning and although participation is voluntary over 90% of students access the online learning modules.

**Conclusions**

The experience at St Augustine’s Primary School suggests that it is essential to make changes in culture as a prelude to the planning of new pedagogies and subsequent construction of new learning spaces. It was also evident that piloting is a powerful way of obtaining evidence of things that work and engages people in change. Furthermore, in order to achieve success planned action must be agreed upon and have some personal meaning for staff before commitment is realized.

Being free to take risks, experiment and ask the “what if” and “I wonder if” questions will engage staff in professional discussion. It is through the professional discussion that opportunities to enhance creativity and innovation occur.

The distributed nature of the learning through the targeted satellite projects provided teachers the opportunity to lead discussion and to take on formal leadership roles. The upshot of such opportunities raises not only the self efficacy of the individual teachers but increases the true meaning of learning as each teacher becomes more personally involved in sharing the learning journey.
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Chapter 10: Receptive Accountability: Supporting a systems approach to an international school reform

Ken Sell, Candice Grimstad and Scott Williams

… that the greatest and most important difficulty of human science is the education of children. (Michel de Montaigne, 1575)

Introduction

This Chapter is about school reform. More specifically it deals with the transformation of an international school in Norway through a process focused on what the school principal conceived as receptive accountability.

We begin by setting this reform in the broad context of the so-called Knowledge Society. Prior to examining the recent Norwegian education reforms consideration is given to two phenomena of the Knowledge Society that have precipitated a rethinking of pedagogy and the traditional relationship between teacher and student.

The authors then posit that by integrating receptive accountability in the reform process the teachers’ working conditions and their professional context will be improved, thus leading to a greater probability of an increase in the school’s collective capacity to raise student achievement.

By bringing these details together the authors go on to explain an approach to school reform where, over the last two and a half years, the three key elements of People, Pedagogy and Partnership shaped the school’s broad strategic goals and its narrative. Accordingly, the subject of this paper and its propositions reside within the contextual
features of the school. These features set the conditions for the school’s reform and led to the deliberate development of a professional mentality in teachers.

Referring to the key findings in the reports *How the World’s Most Improved School Systems Keep Getting Better* (Moursched, Chijioke, & Barber, 2010) and *Teacher Working Conditions That Matter: Evidence for Change* (Leithwood, 2006) the authors developed a reform framework that enable them to locate the intervention strategies in reference to school’s three broad strategic elements; the professional context and the performance stage of discrete sectors within the school. This framework provided a reference point for an analysis of the effectiveness of the intervention strategies.

Finally, a brief commentary of the progress to date provides some insight related to the impact the reform has had so far on teachers and the school. This is followed by contemplative thoughts about the reform.

We turn first to what the authors view as an opportunity rather than a challenge for schools and teachers; that is the quickly changing and globally connected world. As the Western world has moved from an emphasis on industrialisation towards knowledge production as the means of creating economic wealth and maintaining social cohesion, the expectations of schools and teachers are fundamentally different from those of the past. Many teachers now encounter new and complex scenarios and unfamiliar problems (Smith, Lynch, & Mienczakowski, J. 2003). It is in this context that the school reform described in this paper is set.

**The Knowledge Society**

The veneration of the unprecedented growth in scientific knowledge precipitated a technological revolution; subsequently the concept of a Knowledge Society was born (Postman, 1999). In this setting, knowledge is produced through real and virtual partnerships between
people that transcend national and cultural boundaries. Of the various globalised changes that impact teachers, it is the etymology of knowledge and production and the new type of power relationship between the teacher as a digital immigrant and the student as a digital native that has gone to the core of changing the teacher’s identity. It is our contention that a teacher identity crisis has been in existence for a generation now and has contributed to what Smith and Lynch (2010) call a ‘pedagogical void’.

**Knowledge and Production:**

Figure 1 shows that before the 1800’s, the concepts of knowledge and production were written about separately (Ngram Viewer, 2012). Knowledge was something one had and production was something one did.

The process of production, in part, relied on the knowledge of the producer to develop the product and method of production. It is the producer’s knowledge that holds top position in the production process. School systems in the industrial era taught students to prepare them for a post-school hierarchical social order; aiming to produce prospective university candidates or workers. It is not surprising then, that in the industrial era the teacher’s identity was related to the industrial view of production. It was through the
ownership of knowledge that teachers controlled the production line of learning. Their professional identity and sense of value was directly linked to historical methods of wealth creation. Figure 2 shows the role of the teacher in an industrial model of schooling.

By the late 1960’s the idea of a knowledge society as a post-industrial concept emerged (Harriet, Sheldon & Moore 1968). This began to change the thinking regarding the relationship between knowledge ownership and production. From the late 1980’s to the mid 2000’s literature discussing knowledge production began to proliferate (Figure 3).

Now knowledge is perceived as a commodity. Knowledge no longer guides production as a stand-alone input; rather it is produced as part of the production itself. Wealth creation through knowledge production, in turn, requires a different type of workforce. Florida (2006) makes the point that the sources of value creation, and therefore of international competitiveness, is creative talent. Winners in today’s world produce and mobilize, as well as attract from outside, creative workers and talent.
The new knowledge production construct identifies the teacher as a creative worker and challenges the traditional concept of the teacher as the gatekeeper and transmitter of knowledge; the one who decides what is best for the student and what they might need for an unknown future.

**Technology Revolution: The Powerless Pen**

In the past, teachers acted as knowledge gatekeepers, controlling the technology as a symbol of their power. It was through the pen that they controlled, for the most part, what students wrote and read. Today it is a different story; access to written, spoken and visual information is no longer restricted as it has been historically.

New technologies have caused an alteration in teacher and student relationship all over the world (Jefferies 2001). A non-computer literate teacher does not fully understand or control the technology in the classroom and has subsequently lost part of their traditional authority. Thus the digital immigrant teacher is forced to become a co-learner working with the digital native student. As a result there has been, as McWilliam (2007) identifies, a relational shift between the teacher and student with the teacher moving from the ‘sage on the stage’ (transmitter of knowledge) to the ‘guide on the side’ (facilitator of learning).
Although McWilliam notes that the teacher as facilitator has placed a greater focus on the learner, like Smith and Lynch (2010) we argue that ‘facilitation’, as a central concept underpinning today’s pedagogy, has contributed to creating the pedagogical void in the profession. When we couple the trend indicating education policy makers give curriculum the lead role in system development thus leaving teachers to ponder about pedagogy rather than consider it with the pressure to change practice as a result of new technologies in the classroom and it is little wonder the idea of facilitation gripped the teaching profession.

In this context facilitation was the teacher’s life line to resurrecting their lost identity. The problem is that facilitation as a pedagogical prop does not require any systematic research to support action, nor any professional discussion or review of what works or does not work in the classroom. It pushes the teacher to the side and the action of ‘…“facilitating” is that it can become, at worst, an excuse for passivity on the part of the teacher after tasks have been allocated. Many of the teachers who see themselves as Guides are as unlikely to be “fascinating” as they are to be “challenging” (McWilliam 2007 p. 2).

McWillaim argues that between the Sage and the Guide is the Meddler in the Middle. The Meddler uses an active interventionist pedagogy where the teacher plays an active role in teaching. In this model teachers are not only knowledge workers but co-knowledge producers. This type of teaching requires discipline.

To prevent teachers slipping further into the pedagogical void we argue interventionist pedagogy needs to be underpinned by ‘researched-based pedagogical strategies in an algorithmic approach that maximizes learning’ (Smith and Lynch, 2010) and that effective pedagogical intervention requires capable teachers. Stephenson (1992, p. 2) shed light on what a capable teacher might look when he wrote:

Capability is a necessary part of specialist expertise, not separate from it. Capable people not only know about their specialisms; they also have the
confidence to apply their knowledge and skills within varied and changing situations and to continue to develop their specialist knowledge and skills long after they have left formal education.

In addition, Hattie (2003) and Marzano (2003) provide systematic research that supports the development of pedagogical specialist knowledge and skills. Marzano’s research has culminated in the development of a sophisticated yet easy to understand, practical and coherent pedagogical framework. Hattie’s research has uncovered the most effective teaching strategies and outlined the differences between the novice, experienced and expert teachers. Using this research is a good starting point to support to re-establish their identity.

Figure 4: Model of knowledge production in today’s Knowledge Society schools

The Norwegian Education Climate

Leading into the new millennium, Norway implemented educational reforms centred on supporting the social, economic and cultural development of the nation. The 1990’s reforms (Ministry of
Education and Research 2007), emphasised the provision and accessibility of high-quality education and training programs to all citizens with the aim of supporting the development of Norway as an advanced knowledge society. By improving structural coherence and connectedness between the multiple educational institutions in the country the reforms increased participation from the cradle to the grave.

By the early 2000s, the Norwegian government recognised that an education system for all was admirable but in the context of developing, participating and competing in the knowledge society, it was not enough. The reforms turned from participation to ‘knowledge promotion’ with the goal of assisting:

…all pupils to develop fundamental skills that will enable them to participate actively in our society of knowledge…. Everyone is to be given the same opportunities to develop their abilities. The Knowledge Promotion, with its special emphasis on learning, is meant to help ensure that all pupils receive a differentiated education. (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research 2011, para. 2.)

The contemporary Norwegian National Curriculum (2005) emphasises developing student creativity and asks teachers to consider ‘student creative abilities’ as a starting point for program design and implementation. Now Norwegian teachers need to be, as Hargreaves (1998) describes, creative professionals. This presents a problem for the Norwegian teacher educators and schools because since the 1980’s the intellectual framework underpinning Norway’s education policy is based on an idea that was conceptualized in the industrialized 1960’s and designed to meet the European Union’s need for standardised vocational training (Lokan, J. et al, 1995). The resulting fixation on the competency is juxtaposed to developing a capable and creative teacher because it is associated with standardising and replicating established practices.

Stephenson (1999, p.3.) argues that the concept of capability not only challenges and extends the notion of competence but should be at the
forefront of educational thinking and policy development. He states it this way:

Competence is about delivering the present, based on past performances; capability is about imagining the future and bringing it about. Competence is about control; capability is about learning and development. Competence is about fitness for (usually other people’s) purpose; capability is also about judging fitness of the purpose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Norwegian pupils’ outcomes in PISA in 2000 to 2009. Avg. score Source: Kjernsli and Roe 2010 cited in The Education Mirror, Utdanningsdirektoratet 2011

As the competence movement expects replication and teaching based on past known practices then surely it is no longer sensible to have competency as the primary intellectual framework for educational reform in today’s knowledge society. During the competency period Norway had made significant investments in schooling, yet student outcomes in the OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) show student achievements remaining stagnant in the lower to mid-range levels in reading, science and mathematics since 2000 (Table 1).

A more disturbing story is seen in Norwegian schools when we compare the student reading levels from 2001 to 2006 as assessed by the Progress in Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS). There has been a noticeable decrease in the number of students reading at the advanced international benchmark and an increase in the number of students reading at the low international benchmark (Grimstad, 2009). This demonstrates that competency as the underpinning driver of educational practices has not worked in improving student outcomes in PISA and PIRLS at least.
To avoid the intellectual, let alone the practical contradiction, inherent in asking teachers to consider creativity in the design and implementation of their teaching and at the same time expect competency to be the main reference for practice, the Norwegian education policy makers need to replace the concept of competency with capability as the central intellectual idea driving its reforms.

**Theoretical Framework**

The general proposition regarding this school reform is related to the concept of accountability in the context of a school striving to meet the educational needs of students living in a knowledge society.

The authors proposed that by implementing receptive accountability as an integral part of the reform process, the professional context for teachers and their working conditions will be heightened. It is our contention that this will, in turn, increase teacher engagement, motivation and capability with the purpose of ultimately improving student outcomes.

Receptive accountability is a malleable analytical tool that is open to receiving the changing narratives and situations within a school; helps build collective capacity; supports an anticipatory future’s orientated approach to school development and is a receptacle for holding what is important.

**Accountability: A subject of human activity or an object type**

According to Jeremiah Day (1838), accountability relates to the concepts of self-determination, the power of the will and common sense. Day contended that conscious actions are influenced by set antecedents, thus rendering contingency as a sensible explanation for human behaviour as unacceptable. Put simply, we are accountable for our actions. In this sense accountability is subjective. It locates the centre of control within the individual and, as such, is an internal
accountability mechanism. Subjective accountability supports a future’s orientated working environment in a school because it requires the teacher to be the author of their workplace narrative and take personal responsibility for the outcomes. Day, like Saul (2003) claims that common sense is a human quality that helps guide personal decision-making. In the sometimes frenetic work environment of a school, where there is often urgency for decisions to be made, teachers rely on their common sense rather than a considered and reflective process. Individual accountability recognises that common sense as a decision-making framework for teachers is not only legitimate but necessary. There simply is not enough time at times for teachers to research, reflect and contemplate.

By the 21st century accountability is described in types: organisational, political, legal, professional, moral, ethical, internal, external, horizontal, vertical, reciprocal and hierarchical, to name a few. One could be excused for thinking self-determination and common sense has taken a back seat in our decision-making processes. Accountability, as a type, is an object able to be moved around from setting to setting and tends to be divorced from the narrative created by human action. Accountability, as an object, allows for external bodies to measure performance. It is an external accountability mechanism that looks backward to provide point-in-time data that can be used when judging the fitness of purpose and performance, but it does not guarantee it. Objective accountability in schools is important because it can provide an external reference point for review and helps prevent a school from becoming inward looking and self-congratulatory.

The explosion of literature referring to accountability from the mid 1970’s show why some argue we are in a period of accountability overload (Levitt 2008). In the 2002 Reith lecture, O’Neill suggested that teachers are working in a 'hyper accountability' environment. She questioned whether the accountability methods of the day were effective in improving or changing individual and/or institutional performance. She further argued that the set of antecedents guiding
the modern day accountability environment needs to change. ‘…(I)n the end there has to be a narrative’ (BBC audio) stemming from the accountability process to provide deeper meaning to human behaviour and the quality of performance.

It follows that if accountability does not take into account the school’s narrative and the professional context in which teachers work, it is limited as an analytical tool to support school reform. Infusing a deep and sophisticated account of the contextual features into a school’s accountability process supports the possibility of achieving a profound understanding of the quality of performance and the teachers’ professional context. It also has the capacity to offer deliberated references points that can be used to inform future planning.

It was during the Reith lecture that O’Neill (2002) coined the phrase ‘intelligent accountability’. This is accountability that:

… requires more attention to good governance and fewer fantasies about total control. Good governance is possible only if institutions are allowed some margin for self-governance of a form appropriate to their particular tasks, within a framework of financial and other reporting. Such reporting, I believe, is not improved by being wholly standardised or relentlessly detailed, and since much that has to be accounted for is not easily measured it cannot be boiled down to a set of stock performance indicators. Those who are called to account should give an account of what they have done and of their successes or failures to others who have sufficient time and experience to assess the evidence and report on it…. (2002, para 21).

Intelligent accountability attempts to locate the concepts of self-determination, common sense and the working narrative into a coherent accountability framework. It balances the relationship between the objective and subjective accountabilities. It places a greater emphasis on self-governance and requires the subsequent decision making process to encompass judgements of past performance by those called to account rather than those who are doing the counting.
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Nearly a decade after O’Neill’s lecture, Fullan (2010, p.5) added that:

Andy Hargreaves unlocked the door to intelligent accountability when he observed that “accountability is the remainder that is left when . . . responsibility has been subtracted”. Intelligent accountability involves a set of policies and practices that 1) actually increases individual, and especially collective, capacity so that shared responsibility carries most of the weight of effective accountability; 2) makes internal and external accountability almost seamless; and 3) leaves external accountability to do its remaining, more-manageable task of necessary intervention.

Furthermore, Hargreaves and Shirley’s (2009) conception of intelligent accountability is centred around a close relationship between individual and collective responsibilities. Here teachers take individual responsibility for their actions to increase the school’s collective capacity.

Fullan argues that building collective capacity is one key to sustaining reform, because it:

… enables ordinary people to accomplish extraordinary things – for two reasons. One is that knowledge about effective practice becomes more widely available and accessible on a daily basis. The second reason is more powerful still – working together generates commitment. Moral purpose, when it stares you in the face through students and your peers working together to make lives and society better, is palpable, indeed virtually irresistible. The collective motivational well seems bottomless. The speed of effective change increases exponentially (Moushed, et al. 2010, p. 74).

We believe that receptive accountability adds to and enhances the notion of intelligent accountability. Receptive accountability consists of three interrelated elements. First, ‘individual accountability’ draws on the long established concept of self-determination, the power of the will and common sense to understand that it is the individual who is called to account for the narrative they create through their actions. Second, the practical application of shared responsibility not only increases the collective capacity, but requires the individual to be called to account for the school’s narrative. Third, anticipatory responsiveness requires the school policy makers and planners,
including teachers, to draw on the account of the individual and collective narratives to guide future planning.

The first element, called individual accountability relates to whether an individual behaves in a proper manner within a set of predefined professional practices and systems that have been developed and instigated by peers and regulatory authorities. Teachers, as self-determining beings, are expected to make decisions related to at least three areas of responsibility: internal, external and reciprocal.

Our view is that internal responsibilities relate to the autonomous actions taken by the teacher. It has a significant relationship to the personal, ethical and moral behaviours of the teacher. The teacher is responsible for their personal actions and the subsequent outcomes. External responsibilities relate to the teacher’s behaviours in response to the requirements imposed by regulatory authorities and external agencies such as the employer. Here the teacher needs to account for their actions in relation to such things as legislative and curriculum requirements. Reciprocal responsibilities required to account for their behaviours in relation to their peers. Put simply, internal, external and reciprocal responsibilities that reside within individual accountability require the individual to be able to account for their actions in terms of themselves, peers and outside agencies.

The second element is shared responsibility. This relates to the individual’s ability to participate effectively in the development of the school’s collective capacity by accounting for the actions of the collective and then share responsibility for the outcomes. Teachers who share responsibility for the collective actions and outcomes expect that, in a professional workplace, shared responsibility becomes non-negotiable.

Enacting receptive accountability is a development process that starts with the teacher accepting individual accountability, while concurrently sharing responsibility. When teachers are cognizant of, and act effectively within, the individual accountability and shared
responsibility frameworks, the opportunity for greater self and collective governance is increased in proportion to the level of trust created between the teacher and others.

The third element, anticipatory responsiveness, is designed to enable teachers to adopt a future’s orientated approach to the planning process by responding to the multiple narratives when making decisions about future planning needs. Here teachers anticipate the future needs and participate with other teachers and school leaders in the planning process to realize those needs.

Although the three receptive accountability elements can, and do, interact and operate concurrently, if teachers are unable to demonstrate individual accountability then they are unlikely to embrace shared responsibility or function with anticipatory responsiveness. In its simplest form this accountability framework takes place on personal level, develops group or collective responsibility and ultimately engages in being, as a whole, futures orientated. This does not mean that one element necessarily follows the other in a linear progression; however, if teachers do not embrace
the individual accountability then their ability to operate effectively in the other two elements is inhibited.

Receptive accountability, if effectively implemented, enhances the working conditions and thus the professional context of the teachers. Leithwood (2006) argues that it is the professional context in a school that impacts the level of teacher engagement and motivation. It is reasonable to suggest that a high level of teacher engagement and motivation in a school would lead to a better school to work in. The authors also assert that a receptive accountability framework increases its usefulness when it helps create the narrative of the school that supports and informs what O’Neill calls ‘substantive and knowledgeable independent judgement’ of an institution's or professional's work (2002, para. 21). Through anticipatory responsiveness these judgements can then be reviewed and transformed into action by the teachers.

In terms of this school reform, receptive accountability operates within the three broad strategic areas of People, Partnership and Pedagogy as shown in Figure 5.

**Elements of Sustained School Reform**

Prior to the 1990’s there was limited documentation on how a school became effective (Boyd, 1992). The main focus was on what to look for - not what to do. Boyd concluded that leaders wishing to initiate sustainable school reform first had to understand the impact the contextual features have on a school. Ellett, C., et. al. (1997), in their research synthesis of over 400 schools, took Boyd’s supposition further by linking the contextual features, such as the learning environment and how schools are organized, to a school’s capacity to sustain reforms. O’Day and Rowan (1996) identified three interdependent factors influencing teachers’ capacity to embrace and sustain workplace reform: motivation, ability and working conditions.
From the mid-2000’s, literature not only provided an analysis of school conditions, but began to suggest strategies on how to sustain school reform (Leithwood, 2006). Hirsh (2008) identified benefits of improving the professional context and provided several strategies to do so. These include developing shared standards and expectations of a professional context, assessing the professional environment, integrating data into school planning, creating a school as a learning organization, providing safe, supportive and trusting environments, developing school leadership and increasing teacher capability.

The report *How the world's most improved school systems keep getting better* (Mourshed, et al. 2010) goes a step further by explicitly linking the developmental stage and the contextual features of a system to specific intervention strategies. Although this report examines large education systems it can be a useful tool in developing a school’s reform framework as noted in the report’s forward by Fullan:

> This report is invaluable for policy makers and school system leaders who are or should be crafting a roadmap for improving their specific systems. It furnishes a powerful analytical tool with its intervention data-base to help guide such action. (Mourshed et el, 2010 p.10).

Mourshed et al. (2010 p. 18) go on to explain how it is useful to those responsible for school reform:

> …leaders must integrate three aspects when developing and implementing an improvement journey. The first aspect is the status quo, called here the performance stage, which identifies the point where the system currently stands….. .. The second is the set of interventions necessary to make the desired improvements……, here called the intervention cluster. The third is the system’s adaptation of the intervention cluster to the prevailing context: taking into account the history, culture, politics, and structure of the school system and the nation.

In examining twenty schooling systems worldwide Mourshed, et al, identified a four stage performance continuum with an accompanying set of common cluster interventions in the areas of curriculum and standards, teacher working conditions, workforce skill development,
student learning, integrating data into planning systems and policy and laws. The report suggests that sustained reform relies on understanding the relationship between three interdependent elements: 1) the performance stage of the system; 2) the set of interventions; and 3) the context.

Leithwood’s report makes the point that without addressing the working conditions of teachers that are specifically related to their professional context then sustainable reform in schools is unlikely. He maintains that improving teacher ‘capacity or ability’ as a standalone approach to improving school performance is flawed if, at the same time, the teacher’s working conditions do not provide the right type of professional context to work in. He described how working conditions influence performance and suggested recommendations for action concerning teachers, policy makers and leaders. These include teachers building professional networks; actively participating in their own professional development; contributing in the decision making processes; expecting the school leadership to be effective and placing sensible limits around their volunteer work load. For policy makers, he considers it advantageous to act strategically when demanding changes in the workplace. He added that principals need to create positive teacher workings conditions and use of research to underpin their leadership methodology.

By drawing on the literature and, in particular, the work of Mourshed, et al (2010) and Leithwood (2006) we created a framework to locate and provide a reference point for the interventions strategies (Table 2 located at chapter’s end).

School reform does not happen by osmosis; it is driven by a set of conditions that demand change. We start with the conditions that drove the call for reform at this school.
Conditions for Reform: Contextual Features

Changing “any part of the system requires knowledge and understanding of how parts are interrelated” (Sarason, 1990, p.15).

The Foundations

The school was established in 2004 and became a part of the growing international schooling industry. According to ISC Research Limited (2011) there are over 6000 international schools in 236 countries with nearly 3 million students and over 280,000 staff worldwide. This makes the international school industry nearly three times the size of the Norwegian school system (Statistic Norway, 2010). Brunell (2009) describes international schools as flexible and functional organisations, able to quickly respond to the changing economic and political circumstances.

By taking advantage of a national policy that encouraged the establishment of private schools, a small group of parents founded the school with the aim to provide an alternative education for children in the local community. The school has grown rapidly to 240 students from preschool to year 10 and the school community is represented by over 35 nationalities. Most families are well resourced and have professional employment - predominately in the local university, the national oil company and local businesses. The school is regulated by the Education and Private School Acts in Norway and receives 85% of its funding from the state.

Stages of Performance:

To understand the stage of performance the authors analysed school data and conducted interviews with members of the school community, including the past Board chairperson, teachers and parents. The analysis focused on two sections: work conditions and student outcomes. Work conditions consisted of six subsections; Governance, Workforce Professionalism, Curriculum, Teacher
Capability, Leadership Sustainability and Administration Effectiveness. The performance stage in the student outcome section was evaluated using data from the student results in the Norwegian National Tests, the International Student Assessment and literacy benchmarks.

To gauge the effectiveness of the reform interventions, each performance section and sub-section is located in one of four performance stages described as poor to fair, fair to good, good to great, and great to excellent. The assessment of the performance sectors was conducted by the authors based on their analysis of key indicators within each section and subsection (Table 3 located at chapter's end).

**Section 1: Work Conditions**

**Governance Performance Stage: Poor to Fair.**

In 2008 the International Baccalaureate accreditation report recommended a number of issues to be addressed relating to school governance including reviewing the roles and responsibilities of the Board, staff and school leadership,

The School Board, consisting of members elected by the parent body, governs the school under the Trust Act. A former chair of the Board outlined three reasons why the school’s governance model was problematic. Two were concerned with the foundational principles that underpinned the governing constitution and a third related to internal relationships between the Board and some members of staff.

First, there was a false assumption that the parents had a democratic right to influence the school through the Board members that they had elected. Under the Trust Act Board members are not permitted to represent any individual or group other than themselves.
Second, the idea that the school was a 'parent run school' was used as a marketing tool to differentiate the school from other schools in Norway. In part, this led some parents to believe they had a right to intervene in the management of the school. Hattie (2003) points out, that when parents focus on attempting to manage a school there is a downgrading of their major responsibility; that is to help co-educate their child with the teacher.

Third was an internal problem. Some staff members believed they had a right to appoint school leadership positions, thus creating significant tension between themselves and the Board. Conversely, interviews with teachers indicate the Board micro-managed the school. Given that all Board members were parents of students at the school their ‘hands-on’ intervention reinforced the 'parent-run school' concept.

By the 2009 Annual General Meeting (AGM) the school’s internal political problems climaxed. It was evident that the confusion and tension related to who had legitimate authority and in what areas that authority resided had split the school community into three distinct groups. Two groups, both consisting of parents and teachers, became engaged in a struggle for power while the third group consisting of the remaining parents and teachers, acted as spectators, hoping the school would not implode. At the 2009 AGM speaker after speaker called for the school to get back to its core business of teaching and learning and that it was time for strong leadership.

**Workforce Professionalism Performance Stage: Poor to Fair**

Five categories related to workforce professionalism were examined to ascertain the level of performance in this subsection. These were teacher identity; the culture of openness and trust regarding teacher-to-teacher interactions; the nature of teacher-to-parent relationships; and the level of professional learning in the school and teacher engagement.
In terms of teacher identity two trends caused concern. First the majority of teachers considered themselves more as Facilitators than either Guides or Sages. This meant facilitating, as the dominant ideology underpinning practice, contributed to a pedagogical void within the school. One teacher reported, ‘Once we thought that if the students enjoyed an activity that was good enough’. The school’s ad hoc approach to teaching meant the school lacked the professional collective capacity to resist parents’ individual demands and whims. Teachers had to answer to parents regarding matters concerning management and as well as curriculum. This meant they felt they played a secondary role in the school’s development and direction, thus reducing their motivation and engagement.

The culture of openness and trust between all teachers in the school was very poor. Self-interest prevailed and a climate of mistrust dominated. The school was a battleground where political manoeuvres were planned through emails and clandestine meetings. The relationship between the parents and teachers were based on factional divides. Sick leave was twice the national average, staff moral very low, teacher turnover was high and 14% of students were leaving per year. Professional learning was limited, broad based collegiate support and positive collective capacity could not be seen easily.

**Curriculum Performance Stage: Fair to Good.**

Leading up to the school’s International Baccalaureate (IB) authorization in 2008, the school was suffering from curriculum identity crises. Was it a Norwegian school trying to be international, or an international school trying to be Norwegian, or both at the same time? Firstly, the founding principal wanted a Reggio Emilie approach to curriculum while other influential people in the school wanted the International Baccalaureate curriculum with an emphasis on the aspects of the Norwegian curriculum they valued. Eventually the school settled on trying to deliver the IB and Norwegian curriculums concurrently. This placed pressure on the physical
resources and created confusion in the teaching ranks and parents regarding the school’s purpose and priorities.

By 2008 the school introduced the International Baccalaureate. The written curriculum was adequate but primarily owned by individual teachers. The IB curriculum was neither well known nor fully understood by the teachers or parents. The school had one IB trained teacher at the time meaning there were large deficiencies in the collective and vertical knowledge of how to teach an inquiry based curriculum.

However, the IB curriculum provided a reference point for sharing knowledge and practice. The teachers were, and still are, committed to the curriculum and have been progressively building the knowledge required to execute the curriculum successfully.

**Teacher Capability Performance Stage: Poor to Fair**

In 2009 the school met the minimum Norwegian education department’s qualification requirements. Yet the quality and extent of the teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge and teaching skill varied noticeably. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers had less than ten years of teaching experience, with half of those having taught for less than five years. In general, there was a lack of shared wisdom within the teaching group with the inexperienced mentoring the inexperienced. As noted above, some teachers openly stated that the focus for setting tasks related to the level of enjoyment demonstrated by students. In mid-2009 all but four of the eighteen class teachers believed their role was to be a facilitator with two claiming to be Guides and the remaining two Sages.

In general, the teacher referenced their teaching against what Bernstein (1999) describes as the horizontal discourses of practice. Teachers relied on connotative horizontal forms of communication in the development of their practical know-how. Horizontal knowledge is located in context, acquired by experience, shared between
individuals and is important for passing on wisdom. However, it is easily lost and difficult to withstand external criticism. Horizontal knowledge was the primary reference point for planning and pedagogical practice.

Conversely, only a few teachers referred to vertical knowledge when discussing their work. Vertical knowledge is located in systematic research, acquired through study and reflective practice and shared by the profession. Vertical knowledge is important as an external objective reference point for teacher learning. When combined with horizontal knowledge, vertical knowledge is not easily lost and can withstand external criticism. The dominance of horizontal knowledge as the underpinning references for action from 2004 to 2008 meant teachers remained vulnerable and uncertain about their role and responsibilities thus adversely affecting their motivation, engagement and identity.

Sustainable Leadership Performance Stage: Poor to Fair

For the first five years of the school’s life there were three principals and one manager leading the school. The first two principal’s remained for two years each with the third principal occupying the leadership role for six months. The manager was appointed by the Board to administer the school when the third principal went on extended sick leave.

Administrative Organisation Performance Stage: Poor to Fair

As teachers and leaders left the school the corporate knowledge they had developed, in the most part, went with them. The policies and procedures resided with individuals – not the school – and the sixteen policies were located in 78 different places; digital and hard copy. Processes for overseeing the day-to-day operations were limited and confusing. In summary, the general operating structure of the school administration was inadequate for supporting the effective delivery of services expected in a contemporary international school.
Section 2: Student Outcomes

Student Outcomes Performance Stage: Good to Great

The school has been collecting limited data on student outcomes since 2008. These include results in the Norwegian National Test and the ACER International Student Assessments. Additionally, since the beginning of 2010 the school has been collecting systematic data in student literacy and numeracy skills as well as students at risk in years 1, 2 and 3. The Norwegian National test assesses student abilities in Norwegian, English and Mathematics in years 5, 8 and 9. They determine the students’ level of critical thinking skills in each area. School, local and state data comparisons regarding the level of achievement in specific subject areas is available. The International Student Assessments (ACER 2012) provide comparative and individual student data on Mathematical Literacy, Reading (English), and Writing (English). In 2008/09 the school tested students in years 3 to 10. From 2009/2010 the school decided to test students in years 5, 7 and 9 only. There is some evidence of satisfactory student progression; however there is not enough longitudinal data to draw any worthwhile conclusions about student performance trends at this stage.

The National Test results from 2008 to 2011 show that student achievement was consistently above the national average in nearly all subjects tested each year. In comparison the International Student Assessments (ISA) data presented a slightly different picture. The 2008/09 ISA student results in overall showed achievement levels in all assessment areas to be consistently below expectations in comparison to the other schools taking the ISA tests. In 2009/2010 the data indicates little improvement. The two years of reading benchmarking data indicates students are progressively improving in comprehension. The limited data makes it impossible to identify any trends of great value at this stage however the students are reading at expectation for their age.
Reform Interventions

Table 4 (at chapter’s end) shows the relationship between the Intervention clusters, strategic areas and the type of intervention activity. Interventions were targeted to address the six intervention clusters with each cluster supporting the school achieve the strategic direction developed by the teachers in collaboration with the school leadership and articulated in the local tariff agreement (industrial award).

Preliminary Findings

The authors make the point that when this reform started the school principal had examined the school’s contextual features and formulated a reform plan for implementation. This plan did not include a formal study of the reform itself. However, we can confidently say that our findings reflect an accurate account of how, as participants in this reform, we view the progress to date.

There is evidence to show the school has changed for the better, but the veracity and the depth of our understanding about the impact the reform has had on teachers and the school requires deeper investigation. In making our judgements we reviewed a variety of data and artefacts as shown in Table 5 (located at chapter’s end).

The author’s analysis indicates there has been positive growth in teacher professionalism, engagement, motivation and capability. We believe these factors have led to improved collective capacity in the school and an enhanced sense of purpose by the teachers to work together to improve student outcomes.

However, it is the effectiveness of the six intervention clusters and the elements of the receptive accountability framework that we focus on in summarizing these findings. In all six areas there has been overall improvement. Coinciding with the developing professional context is an observable improvement in the professional behaviours
of teachers. The majority of teachers have indicated a higher level of confidence in their ability to articulate the school’s philosophy and programs and their own pedagogical methodology to parents and others.

This is supported by an increase in the number of teachers having presented their work at conferences, the school’s education symposium, and at other international schools. In addition, the teachers’ conversation in school is now focused on education rather than internal politics. There is some baseline data and anecdotal evidence to suggest improvement in teacher capability but by how much and in what areas are yet to be established. In terms of generating and integrating data into the planning it is clear that the school has more of it to draw on than before and teachers are beginning to use it in their planning, teaching, and reporting. Finally, the school now has systematic processes in place to develop and store corporate knowledge in curriculum and administration.

When we turned to reviewing the receptive accountability framework we found that on a scale from poor, fair, good, and great, three quarters of the teachers rated individual accountability in the school as good. Shared responsibility was evenly divided between fair and good. However, all the teachers rated the school’s collective capacity as good. A slightly lower rating was recorded for anticipatory responsiveness with teachers rating the school’s ability to respond to emerging needs spread across poor, fair, and good. This rating is supported by the majority of teachers when they indicated their biggest weakness in relation to being an expert teacher was anticipating the future needs of students.

The authors recognize that this reform journey is not complete. However, we believe that this reform is worthy of further in-depth analysis and investigation for two reasons. First, there is a need to detail the veracity of our claims and make a contribution to school reform research. The second is to provide a tool that supports other school leaders in their quest for developing sustainable reform.
Final thoughts

Reforms are driven when people perceive there is a problem that needs fixing. This reform appeared quickly and with a sense of urgency and was generated as a result of a significant discontent within the school community. Teachers in the school were stumbling around in a pedagogical void. The deliberate development of a professional mentality in teachers was our attempt to fill the void.

When any set of reforms are introduced into an organization (in this case the school) there will always be tensions and uncertainties surrounding them, particularly by members of the organization who reside outside the construction of the reforms or who do not understand their objectives. In the case of the school, these reforms centred on developing receptive accountability amongst staff.

As previously mentioned, the development of a work culture grounded in receptive accountability relies on individuals’ first accepting their own accountability, prior to being able to move into the realms of shared responsibility and anticipatory responsiveness. Until we first learn to accept what role we ourselves play in the picture, we cannot begin to think in relation to our colleagues and the future of our institution.

The element of individual accountability in the school has been addressed through two primary objectives. First, a shared understanding was developed amongst all staff in the school as to what individual accountability means, in both philosophy and practice. Second, there has been the deliberate development of a professional mentality.

Just as the student and parent bodies of the school represent a multitude of cultural and national backgrounds so too does the staff population. In this context then, traditionally, teachers in the school viewed their roles and responsibilities in a variety of ways depending on their own cultures, backgrounds, experiences and training in
various educational systems. Leading into and during the period of turmoil in the school, internal division often took place around disagreements and tensions surrounding what individuals viewed as their duties as teachers and whether or not their colleagues where putting in equal, lesser, or more.

With such a variety of opinions and attitudes surrounding definitions of what it meant to be a teacher, it is little wonder then that there was no shared understanding of individual accountability.

Therefore, the sphere of “People” was a starting point of the reforms, whereby significant time was allotted to explicit discussion and instruction around topics of individual accountability and its relationship to shared responsibility and anticipatory responsiveness. Just as teachers may work explicitly with students to help them understand that, “when you do this…it makes others feel,,,,” so too did leadership staff work with teachers to understand the question of “when you do X, have you considered what it may mean or be interpreted as to your colleagues?” An open approach to developing this common understanding was used. Rather than a set of “directives” given out by administration, it was based on open dialogue with staff, such that teachers and others concerned became active participants in its construction and authors of their own narratives in relation to the whole.

The second objective, the deliberate development of professional mentality, faced similar challenges due to the varied concepts of teaching. Unlike development of a shared understanding of individual accountability, the deliberate development of professional mentality could not take place solely within the bounds of the school staff, but rather also included shifting the perceptions of parents and the broader community in relation to primary and middle school teachers.

The discussion surrounding the position of primary, middle and secondary teachers in the broader social hierarchy is not new. For years many have said that the role of the teacher has become
devalued, particularly in relation to other professions, such as medicine, law, research or business. Too often still, teachers are not viewed as pedagogical professionals, educated and experienced in their fields, but rather more as factory workers turning out a product or babysitters taking care of the children from Monday to Friday.

Despite what one may be taught then in teacher education programs, it becomes quite easy for teachers in this context to internalize and accept these perceptions of the dominant society and begin to view themselves in the same way. In the context of the school, this led to a culture where teachers were unsure of themselves and their work and readily made classroom and curriculum changes based on pressures from parents of perceived higher social standing. It was a case of “I am just a year two teacher, who am I to question a university professor?”

From the beginning of the reform development it was clear that this mentality would need to change, amongst teachers and the community, if any real and sustainable reform was going to take place. Therefore, deliberate steps were taken to develop a culture of professionalism whereby teachers felt confident in their work to the point that they were readily able to stand it up to outside pressures. In addition, other members of the community needed to re-conceptualize their views of teachers and base them not on their own cultural preconceptions or experiences, but rather on the context of the school and the individual. Just as a professor of philosophy would not presume to tell a surgeon how to do their job (despite the fact that they are both “Doctors”) neither should they presume to tell a sufficiently trained and experienced first grade teacher how to teach early literacy in her classroom.

While a multitude of actions have been taken to address this issue over the past three years, three specific areas have been focused on:

- The deliberate allocation of resources and funding for professional development
- The founding and hosting of an annual professional educational symposium, bringing together teachers of all levels and contexts as well as community members
- The implementation and fostering of action research projects in collaboration between the school and the local university.

Each of these areas came about in direct relation to the observed need to deliberately develop a professional mentality amongst staff and garner professional recognition of teachers in the broader community. Using an accountability framework that is open to receiving new information and changing contextual features; is a receptacle for holding the account of what happens within a school and is able to support an anticipatory and future’s orientated approach to school development provides a strong platform to base the deliberate development of a professional mentality on.

By backward mapping the reform process against Mourshed et. al’s analytical tool and Leithwood’s conception of the professional context the authors’ realized that this reform has a systematic shape to it that could support sustainable change.

One thing the authors’ know for sure is that if we consider the changing world as a challenge, it will be; but if we approach it with optimism and see it as an opportunity then creativity kicks in and our work is not labelled reform but simply it is what we do.

Further Questions

Further questions need to be investigated to ascertain the true value of the approach the school principal adopted in this reform.

These include:
• Is there scope for a school reform tool kit based on what we have learnt and what might an analytical tool for school leaders embarking on school reform look like?

• To what extent has the school’s collective capacity really improved as a result of the changes the school has made since May 2009?

• Why is there a difference between individual accountability and shared responsibility in the context of this reform?

• What did the school leadership miss or could have done differently?

• How can we measure the effectiveness of individual specific intervention strategies?

• How will we know if this school reform is sustainable?

• Is sustainable reform reliant on personalities, product or both?
## Table 2: Reform Intervention Framework and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Areas</th>
<th>Intervention Purposes</th>
<th>Intervention Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People</strong></td>
<td><strong>PSE:</strong> Building professional standards and expectations</td>
<td>Method 1: Prescribed and tightly controlled tasks, standardized to minimize variation across classrooms, scaffold and directed learning, whole school approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedagogy</strong></td>
<td><strong>CPW:</strong> Creating positive workings conditions</td>
<td>Method 2: Prescribed tasks and peer collaboration with direct leadership direction and monitoring, consolidation of the school’s foundations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnership</strong></td>
<td><strong>DSD:</strong> Integrating data into planning</td>
<td>Method 3: Peer collaboration with school leadership guidance and support, movement to autonomous decision making processes, teacher as co-producer of school based knowledge, anticipatory responsiveness, creative thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Stages</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLO:</strong> School as a learning organisation</td>
<td>Method 4: Peer-based learning and peer lead innovation, experimentation and creativity, autonomous decision making. Collaborative with limited direct guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention Clusters</strong></td>
<td><strong>STE:</strong> Safe, supportive, trusting environments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC: Working Conditions</td>
<td><strong>SSL:</strong> Developing professional networks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS: Professional Standards</td>
<td><strong>TCE:</strong> Developing teacher capability and expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE: Curriculum Enhancement</td>
<td><strong>TCC:</strong> Developing teacher collective capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD: Workforce Development</td>
<td><strong>BPN:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS: Data Systems</td>
<td><strong>PPD:</strong> Participate in own professional development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL: Policy and Law</td>
<td><strong>DMP:</strong> Contribute in decision making processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability Elements</strong></td>
<td><strong>SLE:</strong> Expecting effective school leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA: Individual Accountability</td>
<td><strong>LWL:</strong> Sensible limits on workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR: Shared Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR: Anticipatory Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: The school’s 2009 to 2011 strategic areas, work section categories, key measurement indicators and performance stage assessment for each section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Area</th>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Key Indicators</th>
<th>Performance Stage May 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Legal requirements</td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Governance model</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Communication</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Internal school leadership</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Direction</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Board staff relationship</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Workforce Professionalism</td>
<td>Teacher Identity</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Learning</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Openness and trust</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer relationships</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent relationships</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher engagement</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>National Curriculum Reform</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Written Curriculum</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Curriculum Delivery</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Knowledge</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher knowledge and skills</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Coherence</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Teacher Capability</td>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher experience and expertise:</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal knowledge</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical knowledge</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Rating</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Sustainable Leadership</td>
<td>Leadership retention</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership incentive</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional autonomy</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>Administration Organisation</td>
<td>Corporate knowledge retention</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative systems</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting systems</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Administration supervision</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Student Outcomes</td>
<td>Norwegian National Tests</td>
<td>Great to Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Student Assessment</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy Benchmarks</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall rating</td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Cluster</td>
<td>Strategic Area</td>
<td>Intervention Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC: Working Conditions</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Whole School Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the Professional Context</td>
<td>Teacher Action Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Professional Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Tariff Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational Restructure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Electives and Community Building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Horizontal and Vertical Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Parent Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS: Professional Standards</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Staff Meetings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Professional Behaviours</td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff Briefings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Collaborative Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Tariff Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE: Curriculum Enhancement</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Personal Professional Development including IB training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Systematic Learning Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Professional Development in Systematic learning Programs and Pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Community Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University Partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WD: Workforce Development</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Whole School Professional Development including IB Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Teacher Capability</td>
<td></td>
<td>Collaborative Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal professional development including Teacher Action Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher professional reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Whole School Systematic Learning Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>University partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS: Data Systems</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Whole School and Personal Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating and Integrating Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Management and Professional Reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Tariff Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Whole School Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Horizontal and Vertical collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University partnerships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL: Policy and Law Developing and storing corporate knowledge</td>
<td>People</td>
<td>Staff Briefings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Management and Professional Reviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Local Tariff Agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy and Procedures Development and Storage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Community Building Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Teacher Parent Collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5: The data type and artefacts used to review reform progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Data Type and Artefacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reports &amp; Documents</td>
<td>International Baccalaureate evaluation, Board minutes, Strategic planning documents, Quality Control reports, Advisory committee minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys</td>
<td>Norwegian national and internal teacher, student and parent. Internal leadership, expert teacher and professional development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Data</td>
<td>Norwegian national and screening tests. International Student Assessment: Literacy benchmarks, Systematic homework program,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>Class, staff meeting and in school professional development events, Leadership meetings, Conferences and workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Teachers, Past and present Board members, School leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>Sick leave, Teacher retention, Administration Handbooks, Staff Recognition Incentive Scheme. Teacher Performance reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections</td>
<td>Key Indicators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work Conditions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governance</strong></td>
<td>Legal requirements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Governance model:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholder Communication:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Direction:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Board staff relationship:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Rating</strong></td>
<td>Poor to fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workforce Professionalism</strong></td>
<td>Teacher Identity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional Identity:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Openness and trust:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer relationships:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent relationships:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher engagement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Rating</strong></td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum</strong></td>
<td>National Curriculum Reform:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written Curriculum:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Delivery:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher knowledge and skills:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedagogical Coherence:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Rating</strong></td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Capability</strong></td>
<td>Qualifications:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher specialization &amp; expertise:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horizontal knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vertical knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall rating</strong></td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainable Leadership</strong></td>
<td>Sustainable Leadership:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leadership incentive:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional autonomy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall rating</strong></td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administration Organisatio n</strong></td>
<td>Corporate knowledge:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative systems:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting systems:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administration supervision:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall rating</strong></td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Norwegian National Tests:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Student Assessment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy Benchmarks:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall rating</strong></td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor to fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair to good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good to Great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great to Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter 11: Turning Knowing Into Doing - The Role Of School Leadership In This New Era

David Turner

For decades school leaders have known that the way to improve student learning outcomes was through improving pedagogical practices in their school’s classrooms. There is nothing new about claims that “teachers make a difference” and, as they are supported by a sound and growing research base, these claims have obvious and important implications for school leaders. However, if it is teachers who make a difference, what is it that school leaders can do that help teachers make that difference? Or more potently, what is it that school leaders can do that help teachers make the biggest difference for students in their class?

External levers have been applied to influence pedagogic practice with some success at a system level (Fullan, 2010; Hargreaves, 2003). However a mature profession will result in school leaders being supported by systems, not being directed by them. To achieve this mature profession requires that school leaders inform their practice from current research, recognise that old models repackaged are not going to produce the transformation in schooling necessary, and action those things that will make the most significant difference.

“Instructional Leadership” is not a new term although it is enjoying a resurgence in conversations about improving schools. It has been in use since the school inspectorial systems of the 19th century and was prominent in education leadership literature, especially in the United States, in the 1970s and 1980s. It has been defined as ‘those actions that a principal takes, or delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning.’ Fullan (2010) acknowledges the importance of instructional leadership, but also indicates that its description alone it is not sufficient. He tells school leaders that “there is important developmental work to be done in respect to clarifying exactly what is meant by the
instructional role, and to develop the corresponding skills to fulfil the role”.

In recent research from New Zealand Robinson et al (2009) presents some of that developmental work. Undertaking a meta-analysis of leadership practices that directly impact on student learning outcomes, Robinson identifies five interrelated dimensions of what she calls “pedagogical leadership”. School leaders:

- Establish and communicate learning goals and expectations
- Strategically resource priority teaching goals
- Are directly involved in planning, coordinating and evaluating of teaching and the curriculum
- Promote and participate in teacher learning and development
- Ensure an orderly and supportive learning environment in the school so teachers and students can focus on teaching and learning.

Masters (2009), in a report to the Queensland Department of Education and Training, also presents important considerations for school leaders underpinned by research evidence. There is other contemporary research linking leadership to improving schools confirming that the knowledge related to what school leaders need to do exists. The problem is there is a gap between what school leaders know should be done to get the best learning outcomes from students, and what is actually done by those same school leaders. This gap between knowing and doing presents the main challenge facing school leaders in this new era.

The gap between knowing and doing

The existence of a gap between knowing and doing can be found in various human endeavours. It is evident in the limited impact public policy has had in reforming and improving areas like health, education and indigenous affairs (Levin, 2010b). “Many states, provinces or countries have launched ambitious improvement plans only to find a few years later that things have remained much the same and the promised benefits have not been achieved” (Levin, 2010b p. 740).
Fullan (2004) has also described the problem of a gap between knowing and doing in systemic reform of an education system as a “plateau”, saying it is a gap between “aspirations and reality”. He suggests that to overcome the plateaus in performance, tackling “adaptive challenges” rather than “technical solutions” is required. The key difference between the two is that knowledge required for addressing technical problems is currently available (it may still be difficult to implement, but much is known in relation to the problem), while tackling adaptive challenges goes beyond our current capacity or current way of operating” (Fullan, 2004, p. 4). Fullan’s “adaptive challenges”, and the power of the status quo in systemic reform that Levin points to, show that externally driven reform is not sufficient.

It is important to note that the knowing-doing gap is not just a policy problem. In discussing school leadership, Reeves (2009) cites research that confirms the knowing-doing gap is also evident in school leadership. He says there is a growing chasm between what school leaders know to be important and how they actually behave (Reeves, 2009, p. 8).

The problem is not unique to school systems and schools. The same gap is also described in the business and management literature where organisations and their leaders do not achieve the results they aspire to. Cohen (1998) declares that managers know what to do to improve performance, but either ignore or act in contradiction to their instincts or available data.

The dichotomy between the action and its description is often palpable. The gap between knowing what to do and actually doing it is often excruciatingly real – and getting worse (Zeleny, 2008, p.2).

Zeleny’s gap between action and doing has been identified and described in the management literature in a number of ways. Pfeffer and Sutton refer to the phenomena as the “knowing-doing problem” (2000, p. 4). The authors argue that successful strategy can be identified and should be easy to emulate, but rarely is this done successfully. They suggest a significant difference between what is known to be successful in organisational practice, and the
action of what is actually done, results in underperformance on a range of indicators.

The knowing-doing gap is therefore a problem evident in organisations including schools and schooling systems. DuFour & DuFour (2007) identify closing the knowing – doing gap as the most pressing issue confronting educators. The problem is not a lack of knowledge but the taking of “purposeful steps” to implement that knowledge. It is also evident that, where knowing does not translate into doing, steps are required to overcome this gap. Strengthening the connection between research, policy and practice offers a way to address the gap (Fullan, 2010; Hattie, 2009; Levin, 2010b; OECD, 2009). However in tackling adaptive challenges understanding the factors that contribute to the knowing-doing gap, as described by Pfeffer and Sutton (2000) is appropriate.

Factors that contribute to the Knowing-Doing Gap

From their experience and research Pfeffer and Sutton (2000) identified key factors that explain why organisations, that can state what they need to do in a strategic sense, fail to implement this strategy effectively. They identified five factors that prevent organisations, and their leaders, from successfully putting what is required into action.

- When talk substitutes for action.
- When memory substitutes for thinking.
- When fear prevents acting on knowledge.
- When measurement obstructs good judgment.
- When internal competition turns friends into enemies (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000).

*When talk substitutes for action*

In an organisation the rhetoric of what needs to be done has to be attended to, not just talked about or detailed in written plans. Planning for a desired future or outcome will not produce that future. Peffer and Sutton note that leaders can act as if merely hearing and talking about work to be done eliminated the need to do that work! Pfeffer and Sutton’s observation is that in some
organisations making a decision seemed to be enough, and no additional work on implementation was required.

The authors suggest leaders spend too much time in meetings, often talking about the progress of projects, and also spent hour after hour attending to emails about these projects. In schools a danger is that leaders making presentations to staff and school communities, developing annual strategic plans or writing reports may see these as the main work, and not follow up with appropriate implementation.

Another aspect of this factor is when “smart talk is confused with good performance”. The authors suggest that one of the best ways of sounding smart is to be critical of others’ ideas. “Only pessimism sounds profound. Optimism sounds superficial” (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000, p. 45). Business schools and academics contribute to the problem, according to Pfeffer and Sutton. Sounding smart is also a way of seeking status and academics are “infamous for trying to increase their status by using complex language to mask simple ideas” (2000, p. 52). Indeed, Pfeffer and Sutton claim that managers were often unable to define, or the definition was “woefully inadequate,” the management jargon they used.

It may be argued that schools and schooling systems face similar problems. School leaders are generally smart and articulate people, and the proliferation of educational jargon is breathtaking. Regional or district principal meetings provide perfect opportunities to ‘sound smart’, especially if the principal’s supervisor is in the room! However the meaningful work is in implementing changes talked about back in schools.

Another example of this factor relates to a relevance gap between academics and practitioners (Brannick and Coghlan, 2006). Critiques of the business world sought after MBA programs opine that having knowledge, sounding smart, being skilled in report writing and giving presentations, skills that are developed in business schools, do not necessarily translate into individuals being able to run businesses. The gap between knowing and doing is presented as a major problem with business management
When memory substitutes for thinking

“Organisations that fail to implement performance knowledge often behave as if the present were a perfect imitation of the past (p. 69). The “sacred cows” of policies and practices put in place in the past, and which have outlived their usefulness, trap organisation in the politics of the status quo. There is a “conventional wisdom” and “pressure for consistency” that mean that when there is uncertainty, people will imitate what others are doing, or say “this is how we have always done it” (2000, p. 74).

School education has developed a culture of its own that has ensured teacher practice has continued relatively unchanged through decades of school reform efforts. There has been much written about the ineffectiveness of professional development models in changing classroom practice. Topics of conversation in our profession persist about reducing class size, the benefits of gender based classes, or repeating students, despite the knowledge that the impact on learning outcomes of such considerations doesn’t support we give them high priority (Hattie, 2009)! The DNA of schooling can be difficult to influence, even in the light of research evidence.

When fear prevents acting on knowledge

Another problem for school leaders is that acting on one’s knowledge requires a person to believe they will not be disadvantaged for doing so. Taking risks based on new information and insight should be rewarded, not punished by school systems and system leaders. Fear causes a focus on the short term, and on the individual rather than the collective. The reward systems for teachers manifests here, as does the process for how principals are promoted, especially in large education systems. A perception of a “failed” project doesn’t go well in the promotion process! Fear based motivation is not consistent with a mature
profession, or tackling adaptive challenges needed to improve our schools.

*When measurement obstructs good judgment*

Poorly designed or complex systems of measurement and data collection also create barriers for turning knowledge into action. National testing regimes do influence student results – at least on the same tests - but as Hattie’s meta-analysis suggests, not significantly. There are more important areas school leaders and teachers should focus because those areas would have greater impact on learning outcomes.

Data collection for the sake of having data (e.g. reading ages, reading benchmarks, NAPLAN means at class level) is pointless unless teachers are using the data to improve their practice! There are schools with extensive databases of student performance, that take a significant amount of teacher time to collect, collate and store, but in which teaching practice is not influenced enough by that data.

Another way this factor is demonstrated is in the current adoption of new national curriculum. This is an important undertaking, because the situation that in Australia, a country of only 22 million people, where a multitude of state and territory bureaucracies generate a proliferation of curriculum and syllabus documents and resources is not sustainable or defensible.

However, its adoption being included in performance appraisals of principals and teachers is an example of how good judgement is obstructed by focusing on the wrong things. It could be argued that within a single school if one teaching block implemented the Australian curriculum, in another the teachers implemented the New Zealand curriculum and in each additional block a different curriculum, there would be little (if any) discernable difference in the results students achieve on the types of data public policy values. It is the pedagogy that makes the difference!
When internal competition turns friends into enemies

Pfeffer and Sutton also suggest individualistic and competitive cultures in organizations interfere with efforts to reach higher goals and outcomes. Many of their examples are related to organizational structures and how divisions or departments (product development, marketing, distribution etc) can “compete” to the detriment of the organisation.

These organisational silos are uncommon in education and schools don’t face these problems to the same extent the business sector might. The reason for this is all who take teaching as a career generally agree on the student-focused goals. However it is not unknown for secondary schools with multiple departments to compete for resources, a sector in a primary school advocate for increased funding, for debate to happen of the allocation of teacher aide time to students with various learning or behavioural needs or conflict over who’s being funded to attend a particular professional development activity. This factor, said to contribute to the knowing-doing gap, can be seen in schools and should be considered by school leaders.

What emerges from the literature about the knowing-doing gap is that it is present and significant in the field of education, and particularly in schools. “Yet there is much less research, whether conceptual or empirical, that addresses the knowledge mobilisation practices and challenges of schools and school systems themselves, and even less that speaks to the role of school and district leaders in supporting the effective use of research evidence” (Levin, 2010a, p. 303).

Practices and policy in organisations have an impact on how people think and work, and it is possible to construct organisational culture, structures and approaches that address the knowing-doing gap (Levin, 2010a; Mitton et. al, 2007; Bell et. al, 2010). Pfeffer & Sutton (2000) present a framework for addressing the knowing-doing gap.
Closing the Knowing –Doing Gap

Pfeffer & Sutton (2000) developed eight guidelines designed to overcome the knowing-doing gap.

- Why before how: Philosophy is important
- Knowing comes from doing and teaching others how
- Action counts more than elegant concepts and plans
- There is no doing without mistakes. What is the organisation’s response?
- Fear fosters knowing-doing gaps, so drive out fear
- Beware of false analogies: Fight the competition, not each other
- Measure what matters and what can help turn knowledge into action
- What leaders do, how they spend their time and how they allocate resources, matters

Why before how: Philosophy is important

Pfeffer and Sutton (2000) suggest that too many managers want to know “how” in terms of practices, rather than “why” in terms of philosophy (p. 247). The critique of education often identifies the “what” in terms of the issues to be addressed, and the solutions are often offered, but not enough attention is given to what might be described as the “big picture” so that teachers also know the “why.” It is the philosophy and rationale about why a change should be implemented that is important.

Operating on the basis of a general business model or theory of organizational performance, a set of core values, and underlying philosophy permits (successful) organizations to avoid the problem of becoming stuck in the past or mired in ineffective ways of doing things just because they have done things that way before (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000 p248).

School leaders need to consider the core values and ensure their teachers know the “why”. This cannot be left to government
policy statements, education department strategic plans or initiatives. Time should be invested to ensure all know why a focus on pedagogy, for example, is important. Teachers should know about the underpinning research behind a decision as this also moves the profession to a more mature level.

**Knowing comes from doing and teaching others how**

Fundamental to this guideline is that knowledge is best achieved through doing. Complex conceptual frameworks, plans, graphic presentations and the like are not sufficient. It can’t be expected that, because an issue has been identified and a plan of action put into place, people will address the issue and implement that plan. “Enlightened trial and error outperforms the planning of flawless intellects” (Pfeffer & Sutton, 2000, p. 250). This guideline has relevance for school leaders and contributes to defining instructional leadership. School leaders need to facilitate teachers moving from the traditionally valued ‘curriculum planning’ to ‘teaching’. The actual pedagogical skill in delivering outcomes for students can be postponed in the current focus on ‘planning’ and especially in current commitment being given to the introduction to the new Australian curriculum.

The establishment of professional learning cultures in schools is also relevant here. Mentoring and processes to de-privatise teaching by freeing teachers to observe their colleagues at work are examples of teachers teaching and learning from their colleagues.

There should also be expectations in schools that implementation of new knowledge quickly follows attendance in professional development. More will be learned from this doing than in the exposure to the knowledge.

**Action counts more than elegant concepts and plans**

Action, even if plans are not fully developed or flawlessly implemented, is preferable to inaction, as it enhances the opportunity for learning and it helps to establish a culture in which “action is valued and that talk and analysis without action is unacceptable” (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000, p. 251). This is another
issue in schools in that “in a world where sounding smart has too often come to substitute for doing something smart, there is a tendency to let planning, decision making, meetings and talk substitute for implementation” (p. 251).

**There is no doing without mistakes. What is the organisation’s response?**

All action has some risk associated with it. Does the school leader deal with mistakes in an appropriate way? Pfeffer and Sutton cite “soft landings” as an appropriate response. To deal with failure so harshly that people postpone doing anything because of the potential consequences inhibits action, and learning.

**Fear fosters knowing-doing gaps, so drive out fear**

“No one is going to try something new if the reward is likely to be a career disaster” (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000, p. 254) There needs to be a “forgiveness framework” because, if the culture is otherwise, a school may be doing well but teachers will not try something new that might involve risk. Employees need to be treated well, even when hard decisions need to be made. “Organizations that are successful in turning knowledge into action are frequently characterized by leaders who inspire respect, affection or admiration, but not fear (2000, p. 256).

**Beware of false analogies: Fight the competition, not each other**

Cooperation and collaboration mean successes are shared, as are ideas and resources. Competition or division in an organisation potentially leads to people working against each other to the detriment of organisational outcomes. Schools in which people work together potentially have less turnover, share resources and manage conflicts better, all of which improves morale and task completion (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2000, p. 258). Talented individuals don’t succeed alone; they have to have help from others in an organisation.
Measure what matters and what can help turn knowledge into action

Successful organisations are built upon a strategy all understand and have a few key measures that are tracked and communicated. It is easy to confuse data with information and people can be required to spend too much time analysing data, and sitting in meetings in which time is spent discussing what has happened in the past, but not making decisions that may bring about improvements.

What leaders do, how they spend their time and how they allocate resources, matters

Differences in school performance is not a result of one school having smarter people, more post graduate qualifications or nicer teachers than another. The differences are in the systems and day to day management practices; those that are more reliable in the transformation of knowledge into action. How school leaders help people do their job is important.

Conclusions

Where much is known about what teachers and school leaders have to do to make a difference in student learning outcomes, doing what is necessary to make them happen becomes a core requirement. While the rhetoric of school systems may include local decision-making, the need for ‘instructional leadership,’ and the politically satisfying accountability generated through publishing results from national testing regimes, the substantive difference for our students is dependent on the pedagogical practices of teachers.

There is evidence the external levers do bring results, but the evidence is also that more significant results will be generated through three school leadership actions;

- Know what the research says;
- Ensure that your teachers know what the research says;
Focus relentlessly on creating the conditions in the school to ensure that knowing becomes doing.

If school leaders invest their energy in corporate compliance, and little changes in classrooms, policy and systems will continue to attempt to influence pedagogical practice from outside the school and this will contribute to the status quo of school education. The knowledge school leaders require to improve schools is evident in the current research. The action required to close the gap between knowing and doing, will also indicate a move towards a maturing profession.
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Chapter 12: Using Technology Enhanced Teaching and Learning

David Lynch, Richard Smith and Megan Hastie

There has been much discussion in recent years about the impact that technology and more specifically information technologies will have on the business of teachers and schools. Despite many calls for teachers and schools to incorporate such technologies beyond just having ‘more computers’ in classrooms it appears the ‘pencil and paper’ classroom regime prevails. With these points in mind this paper examines the notion of innovation in the processes of teaching and schooling. More specifically the paper examines the Knowledge Economy for points of education reference before detailing an imagined teaching and schooling future based on a series of resulting technological advancements and the associated digital communication landscape.

The Twenty-first Century is making its mark as a truly remarkable period in human history. Technological innovations explode onto the market at a daily rate only to be quickly replaced by a new, faster and better version. Take the mobile phone as an example. Outwardly the size has shrunk considerably over the past decade such that its only rival for size is the playing card. Inside the mobile phone, its gadgetry illustrates the phenomena of converged technologies. Increasing a mobile ‘phone’ is a phone by name only as these mobile hand-held ubiquitous devices connect users with the internet, download and install ‘Apps’ and may include features such as a video camera, digital camera, global positioning system, thermometer, calendar, compass, calculator, ‘e-pad’, web tool, and diary. The list goes on. In the near future the versatility of such devices may only be limited by the number of ‘Apps’ available and the inclinations of the user. Similarly the motor vehicle, whilst still designed to take people from Point A to Point B, now commonly features a central computer that governs the vehicle such that driving is supported by all manner of creature
comforts and technologically supported mechanics. Examples of this include engine management systems and ‘telematics’ – the communication of information between a vehicle and the outside world (McDermott, 2011).

It appears only a matter of time before the ‘driver’ is made redundant and replaced by an auto drive system (Rodgers, 2011). Diseases and ailments, once considered a death sentence, are now being efficiently dealt with by technologically advanced medicines and medical machinery. The human-machine interface is a prime example. The invention of the Cochlear Implant (CI), the prototypical medical bionic device, by Australian Professor Graeme Clark AC in 1978, gave the world its first glimpse of the ‘bionic’ human. This invention meant that technology had finally replaced a human sense organ, granting individuals with hearing loss access to the world of sound via a machine (Hastie, Dornan, Chen, and Smith, 2011). With the bionic eye on the production line and the replacement of most human organs by machine now a real possibility, the very notion of what it is to be human is changing. Taken together these advancements represent a fundamental change in the structure of society, such that the way people live, socialise and work today is a radical departure from a relatively recent era in which the church, the school and the community were the mainstays of human knowledge, order and understanding.

Underpinning this fundamental change is a set of interwoven technological advancements that are created by human brain power, networked ideas and stimulated by a consumer market that is driven by a seemingly insatiable desire for ‘a better’, more convenient, social and entertaining existence.

In this new technology enabled world the consumer seeks a capacity to ‘delegate’ the drudgery of everyday life to a gadget, be connected and up-to-date on a 24/7 basis - but only on topics and with people of interest - and have their next ‘want’ satisfied in new and unique ways, and often for free. An example of this is an application called
‘Zite’. This application will create a personalised magazine based on the topics of interest entered by the user. While the consumer appears to be charting their own destiny in using technology to assist, the opposite is probably closer to the truth.

For teachers and schooling systems alike this new societal context is both an opportunity and a challenge. It’s an opportunity because these technological advancements offer alternatives to the traditional ‘chalk and talk’ physical face-to-face classroom learning paradigm and provide new understandings about how people learn. It is a challenge also because this new society represents a fundamental disconnect from the world in which our aging teacher workforce were initially trained and a distinct contrast to the rigid structures of the school and their Nineteenth Century hallmarks.

At a fundamental level this paper is about the capabilities required of teachers in, what has come to be known as, the ‘Knowledge Economy’. More specifically the chapter seeks to define what innovation in teaching and schooling might mean in the context of this knowledge-based economy. To achieve these inherent goals the paper begins with an examination of the Knowledge Economy phenomena.

This provides an insight into the scope of change and the capacities presented by this new socio-economic phenomena. Drawing on these insights as a framework for innovation in teaching and schooling the article then examines what all this means for a classroom and schooling paradigm that is attuned to such a societal profile. We turn first to an examination of what is termed the Knowledge Economy.

The ‘Knowledge Economy’ can be defined as an economy built on the wealth created from ‘know-how’. That is, the selling of technology based products for cash, exchanging them for something else of value or leveraging them to create added value. In comparison, ‘traditional economies’ rely predominantly on the sale of raw resources,
commodities and primary processing to generate income and wealth. The key commodity in the Knowledge Economy is knowledge and its use to create new products and services is key (Moser, 2003; Doyle, Kurth & Kerre, 2000; Donkin, 1998; Gibbons, Limoges, Notwotny, Schwartzman, Scott & Trow, 1994).

In a Knowledge Economy there is a rapid and increasing pace of technological innovation and shorter technology and product life cycles. There are new economic communities, whose prime function is the distribution and exchange of goods across national and continental borders where the market is increasingly technical and the consumer has access to various types of information and communication based technologies (Moser, 2003; Clarke, 2001; Henschel, 2001; Freeman & Soete, 1997).

Given these conditions, the prognosis is that a ‘worker’ in the ‘Knowledge Economy’ will have characteristics including: an ability to adapt to constant change and uncertainty, a capacity to work in knowledge and service based economies, and a willingness to participate as constructive members in cohesive, yet changing, social communities.

So as to better understand the Knowledge Economy phenomenon we draw upon Nowotny et, al (2005) who propose five presuppositions about the forces and conditions that affect both society and education and training and ultimately the whole premise of work: schools and teachers are thus implicated for an appropriate response and in a later section this proposition is examined in greater detail. Put simply these five propositions provide insight into the scope and context for future innovations in education. They are: the growth of uncertainty; the growth of new forms of economic rationality; the transformation of time into the ‘extended present’; flexible space; and increasing capacity for self-organization. Each is discussed in turn.
1. The Growth of Uncertainty
Rapid and recent developments of new information and communication technologies have contributed to far-reaching social changes. ‘Uncertainty’ is cited as being a characteristic of this age: a state in which individuals find it impossible to attribute a reasonable definitive probability to the expected outcome of their choice. Instead, reality is perceived as a threatening series of possibilities inherent in economic life (cited in Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001; Caldwell, 1993b; Keynes, 1937). Further, ‘risk’, once defined as an attempt to curtail uncertainty by assigning probabilities to expected outcomes, is now used to denote incalculability as an inherent feature of both knowledge production and social change. A willingness to take risks remains a key element of human activity and decision making, but it has become more difficult to determine who should take risks and for whom, to fathom the complexity of decisions made and to attribute blame (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001). In more simple terms things no longer stay constant for very long. Change is characteristic of modern day life. Just when you think you’ve mastered or understood a phenomena, the socio-economic landscape shifts and a state of uncertainty occurs. Concepts such as ‘life-long-learning’ and ‘throw-away and upgrade’ have their genesis in such a circumstance.

Interestingly, the emergence of new uncertainties, stimulated by a growing recognition of the potential of science and technology to bring forth new ideas, concepts, methods, and products, leads to new possibilities and in turn, to new uncertainties (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2000). One such example is the role science is playing in understanding the processes of the brain (OECD, 2002). Researchers conclude that learning occurs through progressive construction of individual knowledge, not simply through information transfer (Bentley, 1998; OECD, 2002). This has implications for schools and teachers, because it questions the relevance and effectiveness of ‘traditional methods’ and current means of instruction embracing ‘fill
the empty vessel’ type pedagogies (Beare, 2001; Abbot & Ryan, 1998; Hargreaves, 1998; Seddon, 1995).

The flip side of emancipation through knowledge is the risk posed by the emancipatory potential of knowledge. The increasing spread of knowledge in society and the concomitant growth in opportunities for action also generate social uncertainty. In this sense, science cannot provide society with ‘truths,’ only with more or less well-founded hypotheses and probabilities. Thus, far from being a source of secure knowledge and certainty, science is becoming increasingly viewed as problematic and uncertain. Take the debate about ‘conception’. Does life begin when sperm and egg unite or when the ‘embryo’ develops the characteristics required for birth? These type of questions emerge because science adds new understandings and thus presents new ‘angles’ to explore a phenomena. In a previous era ‘the church’ was called upon to adjudicate in such matters but today ‘science’ competes with various ‘others’ on the internet--- websites, blogs, wikis, etc---such that knowing what to believe is fluid.

We can thus hypothesise that knowledge-based societies of the future will be characterised by a wide range of ‘imponderabilia’, unexpected reversals and other surprises. The increasing fragility of knowledge societies will generate new kinds of moral questions, as well as questions as to who or what is responsible for our society's oft cited political stagnation, causing us to abandon that which constitutes the past and to turn to schools and teachers for new skills and career pathways (Education Queensland, 2000; Lynch & Smith, 2000).

2. The Growth of New Forms of Economic Rationality

In a parallel evolution of science and society, a new type of economic rationality has emerged. This economic rationality acts as principal filter in selecting, constraining and coping with an ever-increasing flow of new uncertainties resulting from developments that offer many and varied options. A major affect of this process is that industry and the research community relate to each other in a more dynamic way (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001). Consequently, the
paths of basic research and future technological applications are converging, with ‘end products’ being assessed as profitable in the conventional sense and sidelined when returns are assessed as unlikely. That is, research now contends an economic rationality focussed towards profitability, irrespective of the outcome and the sectors that may or may not benefit from it.

On another plane, governments of all political persuasions, for example, view technological advancements as an opportunity to rethink and reconceive their product and service-delivery--- think for example ‘e-health’ and conceptualise it as ‘save money’--- but battle and struggle with the 24/7 information delivery context it manifests and the capacity that the individual now has to voice a concern or argue a case with a national or global audience at will. Taken together the economics of society has now changed from a linear logic and defined capacities to a networked conglomerate of possibilities, disrupted and redefined realities and a new set of opportunities for the individual outside the context of an established business entity.

3. The Transformation of Time into the ‘Extended Present’
This parameter is characterised by expectations and anticipations, where actions, choices and decisions are made in relation to the ‘here and now’. However, linking the present to the future (for the reasons detailed previously), becomes uncertain (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001). While people have always had ‘expectations and anticipations’, the future is now experienced as an extended present in which correct decisions and actions can be taken in the expectation that the future can be shaped to satisfy key social and economic objectives. Thus organisations are concerned with ‘visioning’ and the identification of trends and mega-trends (cited in Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons, 2001; Nowotny, 1994). State education publications in Queensland, for example (such as ‘QSE2010’, Education Queensland, 2000), use data and extracted trends to define the future and in turn profess a new ‘vision’ for education and its schools: so demanding new roles and functions of its workforce, whilst satisfying political will..
The strategic plan that has subsequently emerged in Queensland state education envisions the future as something the organisation can and will achieve (Education Queensland, 2000; Beare, 1995; Thomas & Bullock, 1994). Various performance and accountability mechanisms are then implemented down the ‘chain of command’ (Education Queensland, 2000; Edgar, 1999; Queensland Education Department, 1994; Angus, 1993; Caldwell, 1993a) as a process of ensuring the envisioned future is achieved. Continuing employment and promotion in this environment is subject to an employee’s continued performance with respect to the performance and accountability mechanisms that have been set. The outcome for employees being increased ‘administrivia’ and a feeling of uncertainty within the organisation (Caldwell, 1995, 1993b; Angus, 1993; Harman, Beare & Berkeley, 1991). But this doesn’t have to be the future.

On another plane this proposition underpins how people generate and deal with their needs and wants. People are no longer prepared to wait for things. Gratifications are expected to occur immediately and if they are not forthcoming with speed then the interest wanes. This has the consequence of attention spans becoming shorter, or the possibility of people becoming used to ‘multi-processing’, that is, doing more than one thing simultaneously (Brown, 2002). For teachers and schools the ‘whole of term’ study theme, such as ‘The Circus’ can become boring in a matter of minutes, especially when the World Wide Web can generates a new interest at a key stroke.

4. Flexible Space
Associated with the shift in the time dimension, space itself is modified by information and communication technologies so that distance is reduced or even eliminated (Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons, 2001). The creation of ‘virtual reality’ has made it possible to manipulate time and space according to the whims and imagination of users.

The processes that have compressed time and distance through advances in information communication technologies and travel,
often referred to as ‘globalization’, have led to the intertwining of the world’s economic, social, cultural systems. Corporations and individuals alike, now have instant access and impact on all sectors of the internet connected world, including rural and remote and isolated locations.

Indian farmers, for instance, can check market prices for their produce from their mobile phones whilst working in the field. Access of this type, using ubiquitous mobile devices, is becoming more commonplace and is changing the lives of many, especially those in developing nations. When distance becomes compressed and bridged in this way, ‘flexible’ knowledge becomes ‘first hand’, accessible and up-to-date to all those who are ‘connected’ in the Knowledge Economy (Nowotny, Scott & Gibbons, 2001). The premise of 24/7 and ‘any where’ and ‘anytime’ becomes the expected norm. This has direct implications for schools that have traditionally traded on the transfer of knowledge from teacher to student using ‘pen and paper’ and the resources of a traditional ‘book’ library at speeds that characterise the industrial era (Bentley, 1998; Bell, 1993).

5. An Increasing Capacity for Self-Organisation
According to Nowotny, Scott and Gibbons (2001), the self-organisation properties of the 2000 contemporary society are the capacity to define its boundaries and thus constitute everything beyond itself as ‘context’. Consequently, the more complex the system becomes, the more powerful is its potential for interacting with the environment.

Boyd and Ellis (n.p.) agree that due to Web 2.0 technologies, there are “expanding opportunities of interactive, open source and communicative technologies…” and as a result, cite the capacity of individuals to ‘self publish’ using all manner of e-publications or a blog or a website or a combination of all three.

A recent move in Western education systems to devolve various ‘central office’ responsibilities to schools (Smyth, 1993), through programs such as ‘school self-management’ (Lynch, 1997; Robertson,
1993), is another example, as is the capacity of an individual to develop and operate a web based global business from home. These application examples were unimaginable ten or so years ago and their presence today is a result of converged technologies encompassing; information, communications, finance, remote and automated systems and processes and an innate human desire to improve their lot.

The Knowledge Economy and the associated conditions and occurrences as outlined to this point have definite effects on the education sector. As we have detailed, Nowotny et al (2001) have conveniently distilled such conditions and occurrences into a set of fundamentals. Taken together these fundamentals lie at the heart of a new socio-economic era in which knowledge and ones capacity to use it in new and different ways is key. The inherent capabilities required to deal with such fundamentals is what underpins the knowledge and skills base required of the teacher and the rationale and structure of the school.

Before examining the implications of the knowledge economy and its association propositions on schools and teachers the task is to condense the findings to this point for specific reference. To achieve this goal the five propositions, as defined by Nowotny et al (2005) and detailed earlier, are organised and used to redefine the premise of a future school. This detailing then creates a framework in which to examine the capabilities required of the future teacher.

Schools of the Future

A vision of Schooling in the future will suggest not only an evolution in visual appearance and spatial configuration of the physical learning environment including ‘cyber’ dimensions, but the adaption of teachers’ pedagogy to ensure that new and emerging technologies are integrated more effectively into improving individual student learning outcomes. In this case the classroom activities may contain the same, similar or more evolved content, however it is the media used in these
activities that will dramatically change, and as a result teacher pedagogy will need to adapt to manage the use of this media.

The socialisation of education

Schools of the future will see a change in the pedagogy of teachers to include technological devices and activities that support social media and cyber environments, encouraging student participation, collaboration and networking beyond the physical walls of the traditional classroom. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the evolution of phone technology has seen it develop into a versatile mobile ubiquitous communication device capable of accessing the internet, and communicating using text, photos, sound and video.

As touch screen technology has developed, devices such as phones and tablets alike will accompany the netbook, laptop and desktop computer and ‘smart board’ in providing a more mobile device capable of providing an easy-to-use interface where the user can interact with and create learning material. In recent years, however, educators have found it a challenge to embrace mobile phone technology (Prensky, 2004). From the perspective of the teacher, it can be suggested that resistance against the presence of the mobile phone in the classroom has been a futile campaign, with the ultimate aim being a mitigation of student distractions (Klock, 2011 & Katz, 2003).

But as the war has been waged, the time spent exercising school policies may not have been the best approach. Educators comfortable with these devices are beginning to look at the organisational, communicative and motivational benefits as well as the possibilities of developing student confidence and maintaining engagement both in and out of the classroom (Watulak, 2010).

The prevalence of devices capable of accessing the internet remotely has assisted in the exponential growth in the popularity of social networking sites, satisfying a perceived need for people to feel
connected to a community or group. The younger generation labelled as ‘digital natives’ are comfortable with the technology and crave the interactivity that it provides (Prensky, 2001).

Increasingly the use of virtual teaching and learning environments such as the synchronous cyber classroom has enabled students to access education, their teachers and classmates wherever they are located, across time-zones and with greater equity and inclusivity. Worldwide there is a move towards Open Educational Resources (OERs) which provide open and cost-free access to education (Daniel, J. 2012).

![Figure 1: Churches’ Scheme](image)

**Scaffolding learning**

Web 2.0 interactivity has provided educators with a choice of activities where they can assess students and gauge their engagement through individual and collaborative work activities such as blogging,
game-based learning, wikis, photos, videos, peer assessment and discussions, and also in teacher-directed scheduled lessons in cyber synchronous classroom environments.

In and out of the classroom, the application of Web 2.0 technologies, value-add to traditional learning experiences by providing entertaining social, collaborative and interactive activities whilst enabling students to develop higher order thinking skills such as analysing, evaluating and creating material to be published online. Figure 1, developed by Andrew Churches links Web 2.0 and other activities that teachers could consider for better educational outcomes.

The changing role of the teacher

The role of the teacher has undergone unprecedented change within one generation and within our lifetime. The front-of-class lecturing style and generalist expertise of the traditional teacher has given way. The advent of the ‘learning manager’, a facilitative role in which the ‘teacher’ actively engages students in the collaborative solving of problem-based tasks, morphs to an e-learning manager.

This evolution is an effect of Web 2.0 technologies, as illustrated in Figure 2:

![Figure 2: The emerging role of the e-learning manager. (Source: Hastie, Chen & Smith, 2011)](image)

We define e-learning as a result of experiences and interactions in an Internet environment. The role of the e-learning manager then is not
dissimilar to that of the traditional teacher in that to teach is to ‘manage’ learning. What is different, however, is how and what and where students access learning. As classrooms transform from traditional physical spaces to networked teaching and learning environments, teachers need to ensure students have opportunities to participate, interact and contribute in new ways. As a consequence, learning content is transforming from ‘traditional’ to ‘negotiated’ content. This is described in the Table 3 (at chapter’s end):

The contrast between traditional and negotiated content described in Table 3 underscores the pace of technology-driven change in the Knowledge Economy as what we know, how we know and where and when we learn undergoes radical change. Such change can be overwhelming for traditionally trained teachers working with today’s tech savvy students, the ‘digital natives’.

Too often the students know more than their teachers about new technologies and are more practised at using them. This means teachers could easily become part of the ‘digital divide’, rather than bridging it. It also means that teachers need support, training and direction if they are to become e-learning managers and optimise the opportunities of the Knowledge Economy. While this is a priority for students, it is an imperative for the teaching profession.

Teachers need practical solutions and strategies to manage e-learning. While situation-specific demands will determine what form technology enhanced teaching and learning takes, these should not be an excuse to avoid change. Access to robust, reliable bandwidth in learning environments (including homes) means students and teachers literally have the world at their fingertips. The converse is true, of course, for those who do not, and thus the gap – the ‘digital divide’ - widens between those with access to the ‘Knowledge Economy’ and those without.

Internet connectivity provides teachers with multiple configurations and a range of options that they can apply to their programming and
planning and instructional design. We describe this in terms of the ‘Blended Cyber’ model which uses a combination or ‘blend’ of instructional methods, different modalities and delivery media, including online and face-to-face instruction. Participants may be physically present and/or ‘cyber’.

In the Holistic Blended Cyber Model developed by Chen, Kinshuk and Lin (2009), there are ten possible combinations or options, as illustrated in Table 4 (at chapters end). Mode 10 is considered the 'optimal' mode. Mode 10 is a combination of Physical Asynchronous, Physical Synchronous, Cyber Asynchronous and Cyber Synchronous modes of delivery, abbreviated in the formula: PA + PS + CA + CS. Translated into practice, a learner will experience a blend of learning that spans varying time and space dimensions. One interpretation of Mode 10 may see a learner accessing print and/or multi-media resources (PA), attending a physical lecture or discussion (PS), using a discussion forum and/or social media and/or online digital resources (CA) and participating in a cyber synchronous session (CS). The teacher charged with the facilitation of Mode 10 will be the conduit in directing the learner to the various asynchronous and synchronous components of the technology enhanced teaching and learning program.

However, Mode 10 may not be possible in every situation, even though the Knowledge Economy could well come to rely on this model of connectivity to achieve its full potential. Modes 1-9 in the Holistic Blended Cyber Model provide situation-specific solutions. For instance, it is commonplace to find Mode 4 (PA + CA) operating in many formerly ‘traditional’ Physical Face-to-Face (PF2F) classrooms. In these settings the transition to technology enhanced teaching and learning involves the learner attending a physical lecture and/or discussion and accessing online digital resources. Similarly, in situations where bandwidth is limited or time-zone difference or participant availability prevents cyber synchronous (real time) interaction, restrictions forced by circumstance can determine the blend of asynchronous and/or synchronous components in a program. The teacher in this situation can offer students Mode 4 (described above) and Mode 7 (PA + PS + CA). In Mode 7 the learner accesses print and/or multi-media resources, attends a physical lecture and/or discussion and uses discussion forum and/or
social media, but does not participate in cyber synchronous sessions. The challenge then is to match the Mode of delivery to the learner and the learner’s situation.

The digital nature of student publications assists teachers in finding evidence required to assess students on educational outcomes. In the ‘bolting on’ of content into a Web 2.0 classroom, teacher programming need only determine what the desired outcome of a particular topic may be, and scaffold the learning activities according to Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy to develop sound educational results.

One example of this style of pedagogy (Figure 2) relies on the teacher creating a natural digital learning environment by providing essential foundational knowledge, understanding and skills, then stepping back, and facilitating a constructivist approach to learning.

Figure 2: Finn House

The ‘Finn House’, (developed by Ellis in 2011 for the 2012 Hawaiian International Conference in Education) is an example of a virtual environment activity where students can access a design they or a peer has created via a digital repository (in this case called the 3D Warehouse). Considering Bloom’s Digital Taxonomy, students will
use their recognition and interpretation of design energy efficient buildings and execute their understanding of Google SketchUp software. Using this they will judge and comment on the effectiveness a building’s design in terms of providing adequate shade during the hotter months and maximising sunlight during the winter months.

Final tasks could be the modification or re-design of the building to improve on its energy efficiency before uploading into the digital repository.

**Tailoring education to cater for individual needs**

Digital native students are competent and confident in the online environment, and used to dealing with a variety of multimedia that satisfies their individual learning styles, as this type of technology “honours the notion of multiple intelligences” (Brown, 2002). As a result these students expect content to be presented in many forms and to be actively engaged in the negotiation of it (Hastie & Smith, 2011). Simply put, if the content doesn’t engage students they can easily become bored and the teacher and the content are redundant.

The ability of self-marking software provides both students and their teachers with scaffolding learning experiences and instant feedback on student understanding. The design of online tests that are carefully categorised under topics, allow teachers to formatively assess individual student strengths and challenges before students are issued with the next set work. For example, students undertaking a mathematics program may find geometry particularly challenging. They may be given additional geometry units of work, alternate units, or alternate questions presented a different way with the aim of developing foundational understanding.

To affirm the possibilities that lay ahead, big businessman like Rupert Murdoch see to economic as well as the educational potential of digital technology used in a more effective manner. He purchased
90% of an Educational- Technology company called ‘Wireless Generation for $360 million dollars, and was quoted as saying, “When it comes to K through 12 education, we see a $500 billion sector in the U.S. alone that is waiting desperately to be transformed by big breakthroughs that extend the reach of great teaching” (Education Week’s Blog Nov. 23. 2010)

The evolution of the learning spaces

Given the changing and changed role of educators in the Knowledge Economy, it is not surprising to expect changes in the pedagogical approach of teachers to impact on learning spaces and require modifications to enable the efficient and effective delivery of digital content.

So what may a classroom of the future look like? Considering the proliferation of Web 2.0 technologies and technology enhanced learning opportunities in a ‘connected’ classroom, we can surmise the technological infrastructure that may be needed to optimize teaching and learning. ‘Writeable walls’ where the whiteboard isn’t confined to the front of the room and multiple media touch screens we find in today’s mobile phones and tablets will enable both the teacher and students to present information to individuals, smaller groups and the whole class.

To remove the sense of the ‘back’ of the room, where students can disengage or find it difficult to see, a new approach can make use of current technology but more effectively.

Where today’s typical classroom seating 25-30 students is modelled on the traditional teacher centred ‘chalk and talk’ pedagogies of the past….expecting that any learning resources will also be provided from the direction of the teacher.
Schools of the future may have a slightly different appearance to increase the effectiveness of the digital displays for student presentation.

Figure 3. A possible look at a 21st Century learning space. This space incorporates digital and non-digital work spaces, and multiple presentation screens that are linked to the master console.

Figure 3 provides an example of how learning spaces may evolve. These rooms could typically have anything up to 6 presentation screens, each linked to student tables. Teachers would have a ‘master console’ to assume control of each screen.

What appears to be a glimpse of the future is in fact being used today. Innovative educational institutions both in Australia and abroad have been analysing the requirements of today’s 21st Century learners. Figure 4, though luxurious has considered the collaborative assessment challenges issued by educators and designed learning spaces where students can constructively and collaboratively develop assignments in a comfortable, social environment.
The example below at Bond University’s ‘Multimedia Learning Centre’ (MLC) goes one step further by enabling students to access the MLC through the extension of operating hours at times when assignments are due: Weeks 1 – 4 the MLC is open from 7.00am to 11.00pm Monday to Friday and during weeks 5-14, the MLC is open between 7.00am to 1.00am Monday to Friday (Bond University, 2012).

Figure 4. Learning Space at Bond University

Table 3: Traditional Content vs. Negotiated Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional content</th>
<th>Negotiated content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on knowledge ‘traditions’</td>
<td>Basis of a new media age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution centric</td>
<td>Situation and learner specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus is on mastery of content</td>
<td>Focus is on new ways of learning using new technology enhanced learning tools and new thinking power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning is formal</td>
<td>Learning is informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setting is usually Physical Face-to-Face (PF2F)</td>
<td>Setting can be Physical Face-to-Face (PF2F) or Blended Cyber (BC) or Cyber Face-to-Face (CF2F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor provides content</td>
<td>‘Teams of learners and learning managers and subject matter experts create content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor imparts ‘knowledge’ in print and/or via PF2F lecture (message delivery)</td>
<td>Learning managers facilitate learner participation in e-learning content development (conversation) in BC or CF2F environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis is on passive decoding</td>
<td>Emphasis is on interactivity and encoding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners join a school or academic</td>
<td>Learners ‘surf’ virtual learning ‘spaces’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
community to access prescribed content | that are nodes on the network, anywhere and anytime, to access and create unlimited content
---|---
Learners exit knowing ‘what’ | Learners exit knowing ‘what’, ‘how’ and ‘where’

(Source: Hastie, & Smith, 2011)

Table 4: Holistic Blended Cyber Model (Source: Chen, Kinshuk and Lin, 2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PA + PS</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Physical Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PA + CA</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Cyber Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PA + CS</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PS + CA</td>
<td>Physical Synchronous + Cyber Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PS + CS</td>
<td>Physical Synchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CA + CS</td>
<td>Cyber Asynchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PA + PS + CA</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Physical Synchronous + Cyber Asynchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PA + CA + CS</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Cyber Asynchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PS + CA + CS</td>
<td>Physical Synchronous + Cyber Asynchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PA + PS + CA + CS</td>
<td>Physical Asynchronous + Physical Synchronous + Cyber Asynchronous + Cyber Synchronous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: The Holistic Blended Cyber Model – what a learner might expect:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | PA + PS | Learner accesses:  
- print/multi-media resources and  
- attend a physical lecture/discussion |
| 2    | PA + CA | Learner accesses:  
- print/multi-media resources and  
- attend a physical lecture/discussion |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Studies in Education: Leadership and Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> PA + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> PS + CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5</strong> PS + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6</strong> CA + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7</strong> PA + PS + CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8</strong> PA + CA + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9</strong> PS + CA + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong> PA + PS + CA + CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Hastie, 2011)
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Chapter 13: The Challenge of Change in Education

David Lynch, Richard Smith and David Turner

Each of the Chapter authors has presented cases and explored various circumstances that have an impact on the world of education. In each case, dealing with change, which is a characteristic of the highly technical world of education today, focused the discussions. Brennan (Chapter 2) makes the point that universities are powerful institutions in managing and guiding change and his focus on regional universities gave hope to the many regional communities, which through size, history and ‘inconvenient’ location, are vulnerable in a globalised and constantly changing world. But as Larry Smith (Chapter 3) and Sinclair (Chapter 4) identified, the evolving modus operandi of the university needs to be in constant check. Larry Smith’s central argument is that corporate managerialism, often touted as an institutional panacea, may have the unwelcomed effect of having a negative impact on innovation, creativity, thought and debate, the very things that make universities ‘powerful’ in an economic and social sense. Similarly, Sinclair suggests that academics should be entirely removed from Higher Education’s management and organisation so that they can do what they do best, namely teach and research, preferably in areas of interest and importance to others in addition to themselves.
Continuing the higher education theme Allen (Chapter 5) examined the binary mindsets of scarcity and abundance in higher education. Her contention is that closed and open mindsets, stances of scarcity and abundance, are primary influences in limiting or fostering growth and in stymieing or advancing positive and reconceptualised futures in higher education. Li (Chapter 6) exemplified such mindsets in her examination of ‘sessional (casual) academics’, who now represent a significant part of the once ‘permanent academic workforce’. Her argument is that training and development programs in university should be organized in ways that fit the working patterns of sessional academics. In addition, the universities need to include relevant teaching and learning components in their induction processes. Moreover, she says, the university needs to regularly evaluate the induction and collect feedback from participants on how to improve it at the end of each semester’s induction. In effect Li signals how old systems fail to keep up with the new in fast changing environments.

Smith and Lynch (Chapter 7) provide an account of a teacher education program premised on the socio-economic changes of the 21st Century. Their report into the Bachelor of Learning Management exemplifies regional universities as places of innovation, but they also highlight innovation and creativity as the hallmarks of the successful university education. However, their findings also identify existing structural and cultural elements within the university that block creativity and innovation. This working conclusion leads them to propose that teacher education in the form that it is undertaken and is main functions has reached its use-by date in Australian universities.
Taking a deviation from higher education, but still focused on professional learning, Madden (Chapter 9) reported findings from a teacher professional development project he instigated as the principal of a Catholic primary school. He suggests that making changes in the existing school culture is a prelude to the planning of new pedagogies and any subsequent construction of new learning spaces. Interestingly, he celebrates the very elements that Larry Smith (Chapter 3) and Sinclair (Chapter 4) lament as losses in the university --- creativity, innovation, thought and debate--- by stating that being free to take risks, experiment and ask the “what if” and “I wonder if” questions engages staff in professional discussion, which in turn, enhances creativity and innovation. There are no doubt lessons in all this for institutions that are at the forefront of change but forget about changing themselves.

Madden’s findings were not lost on Turner (Chapter 11) --- a State school principal--- who argues that while much is known about what teachers and school leaders have to do to make a difference in student learning outcomes, doing what is necessary to make them happen becomes a core requirement. Turner suggests, in parallel to the thinking of Larry Smith (Chapter 3) and Sinclair (Chapter 4), that when leaders invest their energy in corporate compliance, and little changes in classrooms, policy and systems will continue to attempt to influence pedagogical practice from outside the school and this will contribute to the status quo of school education. Corporate managerialism, so it appears, knows few boundaries.
Smith, Lynch and Hastie (Chapter 12) explore the global challenges faced by schoolteachers, such as Madden and Turner, and university educators such as Larry Smith, Sinclair, Allen and Li, by examining the profile of the 21st Century’s Knowledge Economy and relating it to the requirements of the modern day teaching. While technological ‘solutions’ and ‘opportunities’ challenge the university academic and the schoolteacher alike, the fundamental test for an educational institution is embracing pedagogies that work for students. Madden, Turner and Li, who each cite examples of how systems respond, or fail to respond, to change, also indicate that institutions are not always attuned to the required outcomes for students or the work requirements of staff necessary if those outcomes are to be accomplished.

Sell, Grimstad and Williams (Chapter 10) presented a case study into school reform. Their commentary echoes those of other chapter authors however they cite the role that individual accountability plays in persuading people to engage with social and work changes. They cite two key findings. First, it is necessary for all staff in a school to have a shared understanding about individual accountability, in both philosophy and practice. Second, and consequentially, there needs to be a deliberate development of a corresponding professional mindset. Interestingly, they found a variety of opinions and attitudes surrounding what it meant to be a teacher, and commented that it is little wonder then that there was no shared understanding of individual accountability in the culture of schooling.
The premise of teacher professional development came into focus once again. This was a similar themed canvassed and highlighted by Grut, Hestbek and Langseth in Chapter 8. They highlighted what they perceived to be a directionless professional culture in the Norwegian school system. Accordingly, they suggest that teachers need to be empowered by professional development projects that lead to professional autonomy.

So, from these chapters, what comes next? Taken individually, one could conclude that the transformation of education is a wicked, complex problem not able to be solved by those within the system. That is, there appears to be no coherent solution to the challenges Smith and Lynch presented in the first chapter of this collection. Each of the book’s authors highlights the intransigence of the sector from their position and experience within it. Our attempts to draw attention to identifiable themes in the commentaries possibly only emphasize the challenges facing the sector.

However it is these narratives, observations and arguments that offer glimpses of what needs to be done. If the apparent obduracy of the sector is to be overcome, persistent alternate messages and practices may be sufficient to eventually cause fractures that are significant enough to bring about systemic change. What we now know is that major improvements in education seldom arise from fixing isolated problems. The “chipping away” strategy needs to be coordinated and strategic in its intent to bring about lasting changes: attempts to apply quick fixes waste resources, commitment and energy. Changes need to be driven by attacking those things in the system design that make
different and improved practices and outcomes possible (Gabor and Meunier, 1996, p. 277ff). Leadership from the political and administrative top is a necessary pre-requisite.

Accordingly, alternative narratives will be more powerful if teachers, school leaders and academics work across sectors and state boundaries to bring about change in practices. Just as importantly, if teachers, school leaders, academics and the community can influence policy and politics, things might be different. Managing ‘up’ by communicating what “works” in a more organised manner is necessary skill for education leaders because the role of systemic managers and political representatives is a crucial element in getting things done. Assisting in the “seeing the forest from the trees” is a primary consideration in assembling this collection but its messages need to be aired in other areas where power is exercised. Inevitably, as Godin (2012) observes, when you do important work,

… work that changes things and work that matters, it's inconceivable that the change you're trying to make will be met with complete approval. Trying to please everyone will water down your efforts, frustrate your forward motion … work to please precisely the right people, and just enough of them, to get your best work out the door.

Another alternative is that of disruptive forces, seismic movements that genuinely challenge the status quo of education systems. Examples of these abound but Kodak is a pertinent example of a large corporation being blind-sided by rapid technological change and as a
consequence, expiring. There is no shortage of threats to ‘education’ in today’s world.

However, new models in the education sector are difficult to sustain from the inside, as Smith and Lynch demonstrate in Chapter 7. But it is feasible now, more responsive and adaptive players could enter the education marketplace and achieve universal reform in a crisis environment. In that situation, the Smith and Lynch proposals would be benign. In short, not that one or the other way is a sure bet way to break the intransigence in the education sector, but we maintain that change is inevitable because the present school-university-government arrangement is itself incoherent and change is inevitable.
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