

The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative

Marcia Devlin (PhD)
Centre for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Melbourne

Keynote paper INTRODUCTION

**Vice-Chancellor's Learning and Teaching Colloquium 2007
University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia
30 May 2007**

Good afternoon.

I'd like to start by accepting the Welcome to Country offered to me this morning by elder Mr Anthony Beezley, acknowledging the traditional owners of the land on which we are meeting today and paying my respects to Mr Beezley and other elders of those peoples.

I'd also like to acknowledge

- The Vice-Chancellor, Professor Paul Thomas, AM;
- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Professor Greg Hill
- The Pro-Vice Chancellor and Chair of the Learning and Teaching Management Committee, Professor Robert Elliott
- And guests from academic development units at other universities

I'd also like to acknowledge the significant and growing number of people from the University of the Sunshine Coast attending the Vice-Chancellor's Learning and Teaching Colloquium – thank you for your interest.

I'd like to sincerely thank the University for inviting me here to give the keynote presentation at the Colloquium – it is an honour to be asked and to have the opportunity to share my views, and the questions I have, with you.

I look forward to hearing your views at the conclusion of my presentation.

The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative

Marcia Devlin (PhD)
Centre for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Melbourne

Keynote paper
Vice-Chancellor's Learning and Teaching Colloquium 2007
University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia
30 May 2007

The notion of 'the scholarship of teaching' has enjoyed a growing level of attention over the past decade and a half. This keynote will examine the congruence between the scholarship of teaching, and national and institutional values and priorities in relation to teaching in higher education. The presentation will conclude by offering some principles for guiding the development of an individual scholarship of teaching.

What is the scholarship of teaching?

It is often useful to start a discussion with a clear understanding of what a phenomenon or concept means. One of the challenges of defining the scholarship of teaching is that 'the grandfather' of the concept, Ernest Boyer, did not really define it *per se*. As many of you here would be aware, Boyer (1990) asserts that scholarship has four separate yet overlapping dimensions: the scholarship of discovery (traditional research), the scholarship of integration (making connections, such as through critical literature reviews), the scholarship of application (professional practice), and the scholarship of teaching. This expanded idea of scholarship attempts to elevate teaching from a routine, often secondary function to a central component of an academic's scholarly life, perhaps even equal to research in importance and status.

There have been numerous attempts to pin down the notion of the scholarship of teaching, sometimes also known as the scholarship of teaching and learning. These attempts include highlighting particular aspects of the notion, such as rigorous and thoughtful investigation of student learning; communicating and disseminating findings, including through presentations and publications; subjecting one's work to critical review and evaluation by members of one's community; and the knowledge building that results from the sharing of outcomes (Carnegie, 2007; Healey, 2000; McKinney, 2004; Shulman, 1999). A number of authors use the metaphor of the classroom as the 'laboratory' where student learning is examined (see for example, Crebin, 1996; Cross, 1990). But of course the scholarship of teaching does not only happen within the classroom.

The concept originated in America and the bulk of the work done in the area has been in an American context. One definition that has been suggested by Australian authors encompasses three related activities: engagement with the existing knowledge on teaching and learning; self-reflection on teaching and learning in one's discipline; and sharing ideas about teaching and learning publicly (Martin, Benjamin, Prosser, and Trigwell, 1999). But this definition might lead to the assumption that the scholarship of teaching is a one-off endeavour. In summarising the scholarship of teaching as *ongoing* learning about teaching and the demonstration of such knowledge, Kreber and Cranton (2000) point to the aspect of continuity that some proponents of the concept see as critical.

Building on Boyer's work in their book *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, Glassick, Taylor Huber, and Maeroff (1997) identified six standards against which they believe all scholarly work, including the scholarship of teaching, should be evaluated. These standards were chosen because they are familiar to academic staff in evaluating research (or as it is otherwise called, 'the scholarship of discovery'). Glassick *et al.* (1997) claim that scholarly work should have clear goals; incorporate adequate preparation and appropriate methods; and produce significant results, which should be presented effectively. On all of this, they argue, there should be reflective critique, which ultimately leads to new understandings on the part of the teacher.

One critical aspect of the notion of the scholarship of teaching is the aspect of sharing what is discovered about teaching and learning with others. According to some proponents of the notion of the scholarship of teaching, teaching should be connected to scholarly communities through documentation, exchange and peer review (Hutchings, Babb and Bjork, 2002). Some suggest that critical review by one's professional peers is essential to the scholarship of teaching, as it is to the scholarship of discovery.

Later evolutions of the concept and term, 'the scholarship of teaching' went to lengths to emphasise the *learning* associated with the teaching in scholarship (see for example, Shulman and Hutchings, 1999). My personal view of this is these attempts to emphasise the learning aspect of the concept create the illusion that the understanding of effective teaching as that which produces student learning, is a new understanding. However, it is likely that university teachers have understood the centrality of student learning to teaching since the beginning of university education. If teaching is understood, as it traditionally has been, as an activity that produces learning, then 'the student learning perspective' is implicit in the notion of teaching and the scholarship of learning is implicit in the scholarship of teaching. After all, is it really 'teaching' if students aren't learning? However, having said that, the recent articulation of 'learning' in the scholarship of teaching has perhaps been useful in making explicit what had previously been implicit, which in turn may have led to greater attention being given to student learning outcomes (Baldwin, 2006).

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

What of the forms of the scholarship of teaching? The term 'scholarship' may conjure up for some, or perhaps many, the traditional image of a published article or book. Others will assume that 'scholarship' refers to a social sciences approach. However, a wide range of methods and 'genres' are now considered to be examples of the scholarship of teaching. These include colloquia and on-line resources of various kinds developed through control group studies, narratives and many other methods (Hutchings, Babb and Bjork, 2002).

Why the sustained interest?

Why has the scholarship of teaching experienced a sustained and apparently increasing focus since its inception? It may be that, as Knapper and Piccinin (1999) note,

University teaching is almost unique among professions because its practitioners generally receive no advanced training for their major role and, once appointed, usually teach in isolation from the scrutiny of colleagues. Here we have a sort of double jeopardy in the sense that teaching is largely an amateur activity (in both the good and the bad sense of that word) and is also an essentially private one, at least where colleagues are concerned (p. 3).

There is an argument that the scholarship of teaching provides a way in which the isolation these authors describe can be addressed, for the benefit of all concerned. As many of the authors in the area point out, an important outcome from the scholarship of teaching is moving teaching from a private, isolated activity to one that is placed in a community of critical peers.

At a broader level, in Australia, there would seem to be several contextual influences that have combined to create an environment where a sustained interest in what 'works' in university teaching is not surprising.

These influences include the massification of the student population with the Dawkins reforms of the late 1980s and the resulting diversity of the university student body. The need for a wider range of teaching approaches than had previously been used became apparent to many teaching academics in the early 1990s. Second, internationalisation and the influx of an increasing number and proportion of international students to Australian universities, driven partly by changes to the way universities are funded, have also highlighted the need to teach in ways that can accommodate a wider range of learning styles and preferences and a wider range of language, cultural and educational backgrounds. Third, technological advances and changes have also had their influence, both assisting teaching staff with managing diversity and adding to the complexity of the university teaching and learning environment.

More recently, an increased focus on quality assurance and the emergence of the Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA) have meant that the quality of teaching

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

has come increasingly under the spotlight within universities. So, too, the creation, and then widespread use of, the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) with its Good Teaching and other scales and the use of the data from this questionnaire by prospective students through avenues such as the *Good Universities Guide* have made the quality of teaching a higher priority than it had previously been. And clearly, the arrival of the National Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (the Carrick Institute) and the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) have also had a significant impact. These two initiatives are discussed further below.

National priorities in Australian higher education

In Australia and beyond, attention is increasingly being paid to the quality of teaching and learning in higher education. Worldwide, there are requirements for greater accountability and efficiency in the context of greater student diversity and reduced funding. Higher education teaching is becoming more professionalised with some countries setting up accreditation bodies to ensure competencies. Universities are allocating budgets towards the improvement of teaching and learning and academic staff are paying increasing attention to these aspects of their work (Goodyear and Nativa, 2002).

In addition to the changes evident in the global context, this is a time of significant change in Australian higher education. The 2003 federal review of higher education has resulted in fundamental and far-reaching changes to the funding and management of Australian higher education providers. It is worth exploring two major national initiatives that came from this review that have focused the attention of universities on teaching and learning.

The National Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (the Carrick Institute), created in late 2004 is intended "...to provide a national focus for the enhancement of learning and teaching in Australian higher education institutions" (DEST, 2005a). A significant and growing number of Carrick Institute projects, grants and schemes have been announced in the short period since the Institute commenced operations and funding to universities through these initiatives has begun in earnest.

Specific current programs include the highly competitive Carrick Awards for Australian University Teaching; the Discipline-Based Initiatives Scheme, designed to encourage the sharing of quality practice and initiatives; the three-pronged Grant Programs incorporating the Leadership for Excellence in Learning and Teaching Program, the Priority Projects Program and the Competitive Grants Program. The Carrick Institute also has a Fellowship Scheme and a Resource Identification and Networking (RIN) Portfolio (Carrick, 2007).

The second major national initiative, the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF), announced in 2003, was set up, according to DEST, to reward institutions that

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

best demonstrate excellence in learning and teaching (DEST, 2005b). While adjustments and refinements have been, and will continue to be, made to the LTPF, the scheme is fully operational and the first round of funding awards was made in late 2005 for 2006 and a subsequent round made in 2006 for 2007. The LTPF specifies that funding allocations are determined once institutions meet specific teaching-related requirements. These include probation and promotion practices and policies that include effectiveness as a teacher as a criterion for academics who teach, and systematic student evaluation of teaching and subjects – the results of which must inform probation and promotion decisions for these academics (DEST, 2003). While, over a period of some years, the pressure on universities to collect and use student evaluations of teaching has been building across the sector and teaching-related practices and policies such as these have been in place in some universities for some time, the LTPF has focused attention on learning and teaching at a sectorial and institutional level in a way not previously seen in Australia.

Once the so-called ‘hurdle requirements’ outlined above are met, funding allocations are then made on the basis of a set of performance indicators using a complex adjustment methodology. The performance indicators are derived from the Graduate Destination Survey (GDS), the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) and DEST’s annual university statistics collection. For those who aren’t familiar with these indicators, it is worth spending a few moments outlining them.

The GDS and the CEQ are administered by Graduate Careers Australia annually in association with Australian higher education institutions. With the GDS, graduates are surveyed about four months after they have completed their course. Information is collected about their employment status, the type of work they are undertaking and any further study undertaken. The GDS data used in the LTPF are the proportion of graduates in full-time employment and the proportion of graduates in further part-time or full-time study (DEST, 2007).

The CEQ is an annual survey covering the attitudes of graduates towards their courses and the skills they acquired while undertaking tertiary education. The CEQ data used in the LTPF are graduate level of satisfaction with their generic skills; graduate level of satisfaction with the teaching they experienced over their course and overall graduate satisfaction (measured by the single item in the CEQ) (DEST, 2007).

Student progress rates, that is the proportion of subject load passed by students; and retention, that is the proportion of students who either completed in that year or were retained in the subsequent year, are determined from data supplied by institutions (DEST, 2007).

The data are subjected to an adjustment process. According to DEST(2007):

The adjustment process is designed to provide a ‘level playing field’ so that all universities participating in the fund may be assessed on

their learning and teaching performance alone, independent of external influences. For example, it is known that part-time students are more likely to drop out of university than full-time students. Therefore, universities with a higher proportion of part-time students are likely to have lower retention rates than those with a higher proportion of full-time students. The adjustment process works by adjusting the results to compensate for the 'disadvantage' of having a high proportion of part-time students. Different adjustment techniques are used for each performance indicator, depending on the nature of the information collected.

Given its complexity, it is difficult to determine whether or not the adjustment process is fair and whether or not it does, in fact, create the 'level playing field' it is designed to create. In addition, the indicators of teaching performance mentioned above are highly contentious. Encouragingly, the federal Government seem genuinely open to improving the LTPF, including through changing the indicators and making refinements to the adjustment process, as their willingness to act on expert advice to date has shown.

Congruence of the scholarship of teaching with national priorities

It would be fair to say that our teaching activity in Australian higher education is driven, to some extent, by the Carrick Institute and the LTPF. So, to what extent does the scholarship of teaching fit with these two national initiatives? In short, very well, it would seem, with the former and less clearly, perhaps, with the latter. In essence, the Carrick Institute provides a suite of incentives, in the form of funded initiatives, to encourage the identification, sharing and implementation of scholarly practice in teaching and learning. Some might argue that it exists, primarily it would seem, to promote the scholarship of teaching. The LTPF might be more accurately described as a regulating mechanism where participation is not compulsory but, in a marketised environment, where rankings are commonplace and appear to matter to prospective domestic and international students, the consequences for non-participation may be adverse for an institution.

The objectives of the Carrick Institute include fostering excellence in higher education teaching and promoting and supporting strategic change toward the enhancement of teaching. Overall, a priority "...is to develop effective mechanisms for the identification, dissemination and embedding of good individual practice and institutional practice into the higher education sector" (Carrick, 2007). Taking a closer look at one of the Carrick programs, the Teaching Awards, it is clear that there has been an explicit attempt to incorporate some aspects of the scholarship of teaching into the criteria used to judge applications. For example, one of the five criteria about which applicants must provide evidence from their own practice is 'Scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching'. The guidelines for the awards suggest applicants might include evidence of how they have:

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

- shown advanced skills in evaluation and reflective practice;
- participated in and contributed to professional activities;
- coordinated, managed and led courses;
- conducted and published research related to teaching; and/or
- demonstrated leadership through activities that have broad influence on the profession (Carrick, 2007).

Other Carrick programs, too, appear to incorporate aspects of the scholarship of teaching. The Discipline-Based Initiative Scheme and the Grant Programs variously require setting clear project goals related to improving teaching and learning, thorough and scholarly investigation of existing knowledge in the area and the synthesis of this with rigorous new investigation, and the production and wide dissemination of the findings.

But despite its apparent alignment with the notion of the scholarship of teaching, the Carrick Institute is new and its mission untested in Australia. It has not yet shown that its activities, which appear to be underpinned by this scholarship, can and will positively affect the quality of teaching and learning in Australian higher education. In addition, Carrick operates as a meritocracy, which may mean that it rewards those institutions who are well resourced enough to have teams of people working on bids and tenders and using previous successes with applications as evidence of their capacity to carry out subsequent projects. What of those institutions not so well resourced who wish to make genuine attempts at improving their teaching?

Is the scholarship of teaching congruent with the values and priorities of USC?

Moving now from a national focus to an institutional one, is the scholarship of teaching congruent with the values and priorities of USC?

Let's start with a small tangent. Dallat and Rae (1993) quote from a 1964 report for the United Kingdom on university teaching methods that said:

A person who adopts the career of university teacher does not do so in most cases because his main object is to teach. A more usual motive is the desire to pursue research in a subject which has engaged his interest as a student, teaching being regarded as a duty incidental to a life of scholarship. And, whatever the motive which first led him to adopt an academic career, he soon realises that it is on his achievement as a scholar rather than as a teacher that his advancement in his profession will depend (Hale, 1964, paragraph 354, cited in Dallat and Rae, 1993, p. 270).

It is more than 40 years since this observation was made in the UK yet it is arguably an accurate description of some, or perhaps in places, much of academia in Australia today. Kane, Sandretto and Heath (2002) point out that at universities, academics are expected to focus on producing and disseminating knowledge. There are related challenges when

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

academic staff view teaching as the delivery, or presentation, of content and view student learning as wholly the students' responsibility with little to do with academic staff.

Saroyan *et al.* (2004) point out, "...many professors consider themselves subject experts and scholars rather than teachers or even teacher-scholars within their discipline" (p. 16). These authors suggest that for many academic staff, "Planning for and organising the course content or 'what should be covered' takes priority over thinking about *how* to teach the course so that students learn well" (p. 16). To what extent does all of this describe the culture at The University of the Sunshine Coast (USC)?

If a particular university could be described to a large extent like this, it is possible that the scholarship of teaching may be one avenue that might be taken to address the lack of focus on, and understanding of, teaching. But success in taking such an avenue, like many possible avenues in high education, will depend on the willingness of individual teaching staff to engage with the notion of the scholarship of teaching. More on individual contributions in a moment.

The mission of the USC is to be a major catalyst for, amongst other things, 'educational advancement in the region'. Is it likely that the scholarship of teaching will threaten or advance that mission?

Might the pursuit of the scholarship of teaching contribute to the sustainability of a learning culture at USC? Might it have the potential to positively impact on teaching practices across departments and Faculties? Does the scholarship of teaching have the potential to improve teaching and learning within subjects and courses at USC? Or is it likely to detract attention and resources from other more important areas or objectives? If so, what are these other areas and objectives? These are, of course, questions for USC to consider, particularly in light of the impending Research Quality Framework.

Some of our more astute colleagues might ask, what is the evidence that the scholarship of teaching is worth the time and effort involved? What is the evidence, in USC's case for instance, that it will lead to 'educational advancement in the region' or to better learning outcomes for students? This is an excellent question as it highlights that our collective agreement in Australia to take the avenue offered through the scholarship of teaching is, to some extent, an article of faith. We don't yet have any proof that, in the Australian context, this is where we should be putting our energies. There is not yet any hard evidence that the scholarship of teaching will necessarily lead to specific improvements in teaching or learning institutionally or nationally. It may do, but those improvements might have occurred anyway because the individual person undertaking the scholarship is a dedicated, gifted and/or committed teacher who was likely to improve their teaching and/or to inspire high quality student learning in any case.

Where does this leave USC? Well, let's momentarily consider *not* engaging with the scholarship of teaching. If we do not think deeply about our teaching and our students' learning in our own specific contexts, conduct rigorous studies to examine the impacts of

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

our approaches and innovations, share our findings with critical colleagues who can help us interpret and understand them and learn from others undertaking the same sorts of investigations, how will we know *that* our students are learning? How will we know *what* our students are learning? *How* are students are learning? And for that matter, *where* they are learning and *why* – what factors and aspects are motivating them, capturing their imagination, engaging them intellectually? And without detailed knowledge of our students' learning, how can we improve our teaching? How will we know whether our university's mission is being advanced? And how will we challenge the indicators that are used to measure our teaching performance nationally, where such challenge is necessary?

On this latter point, the federal government is very keen to foster diversity in Australian universities and for individual institutions to 'play to their strengths'. Might the quality of teaching, continually advanced through the scholarship of teaching be a strength of USC? Are there aspects of the teaching and learning that occur in this institution that might be rigorously interrogated, analysed, written up and disseminated as contributions to the evidence-based scholarship of teaching literature?

There are teaching-related areas of USC around which a scholarly approach might be helpful. For example, the recent AUQA (2007) report on USC noted the need to develop processes to systematically analyse student feedback and communicate these to students. This development is a potentially fertile site for the use of the scholarship of teaching framework. For example, the articulation of *clear goals* to guide the ways in which the analysis and communication back to students takes place would help ensure that the necessary processes were ultimately appropriate and useful. Student input into the development of processes would contribute to a *highly appropriate methodology* as student views on what sort of feedback they want would be critical to ensuring successful outcomes. The methodology might also include a thorough documentation of the trial and ultimate implementation of the new system. If this documentation were subjected to rigorous peer-review and subsequent amendments to the processes were made, a scholarship of teaching framework might make a highly significant contribution to this critically important part of USC's operations. And the work commenced by Bruce Willimas and Anna Potter that I heard about earlier today may be a good starting point.

Similarly, the areas of USC's assessment policy; embedding graduate attributes in undergraduate curricula and use of work-integrated learning are other possible sites where a scholarship of teaching framework might be a useful guiding framework. [Gayle Mayes' work looking at student feedback on graduate attributes in work-integrated learning and, in particular, the rigour with which she is undertaking that work, means that USC already has a potential leader in a number of areas it might want to investigate further or on a greater scale. One area that might distinguish USC and assist in challenging the LTPF indicators, should the university choose to make such a challenge, is a scholarly examination of attrition rates, given the university's outstanding record in access and equity and the fact that some of the students entering this university may not have the ENTER scores or, perhaps, the cultural and social capital that students at other

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

universities might have. Similarly, a scholarly investigation of Indigenous student outcomes might result in valuable findings in terms of retention strategies for these students – finding that would be helpful to advancing this university’s mission as well as more broadly to advancing Indigenous higher education.

USC might consider the use of a broad scholarship of teaching framework to investigate and then articulate, and demonstrate with evidence, areas of teaching-related practice in which the university is excelling. These might not necessarily all be on the national radar but institutional missions and priorities don’t always fit neatly with national imperatives, for good reasons.

Is the scholarship of teaching congruent with individual values and priorities?

Ramsden (2003) argues strongly that it is the environment in which an individual teacher works and “...the system of ideas which that environment represents”, including “...teams, curricula, course and departments” (p. 9), that ought to be considered very carefully when reflecting on the quality of teaching in universities. Asmar (2002) has argued that the emphasis of academic development must be “...on the strategic focus of the institution as a whole – *rather than* on the professional development of individual academics...” (Asmar, 2002, p.19, emphasis added).

However, as I have pointed out elsewhere, these two foci are not mutually exclusive and it is appropriate for universities to work toward both global strategic initiatives and individual academic development concurrently (Devlin, 2003).

Despite having suggested that it was the bigger picture that mattered most, in reflecting on the University of Sydney’s experience of attempts to improve teaching, Asmar (2002) acknowledges that “...[i]t was as important for faculties to get involved as it was for individual teachers to realise that they could make a difference and be rewarded for doing so” (p. 21). Ramsden (2003) also acknowledges that the “...level of the individual academic is an important point of influence” (p. 9). Weimer and Lenze (1997) concur, arguing that an individual academic might attend a workshop on teaching strategies, for example, but that “...the interventions, in and of themselves, do not improve instruction. They are the methods used to motivate and inform instructional change, but the faculty member alone implements the alteration” (p. 205).

I concur with this view and as I have argued:

...the basis of successful institutional change in the area of teaching is the development of the individual teacher who must make the choice to implement policy, embrace change and focus on improving teaching and learning. Whether in individual, discipline, Departments, Faculty, College or centralised Certificate or other group consultations or programs, the individual university teacher is at the / core of teaching and learning improvement. He or she is at the heart of students’ day-to-day,

Please reference as: Devlin, M. (2007). *The scholarship of teaching in Australian higher education: A national imperative*. Keynote address at the Vice-Chancellors Colloquium, The University of the Sunshine Coast, Queensland, Australia, May 30, 2007.

semester-to-semester and overall learning experiences (Devlin, 2003, pp. 77/78).

For these reasons, it is important to consider the individuals involved in the scholarship of teaching.

Given all we have explored here in terms of national and institutional imperatives, what might the scholarship of teaching mean for you as a higher education teacher? Could it help you better understand your students' learning? Might it contribute to improving your teaching? Will it help you advance your career? Or will you use other avenues for advancement? These are questions for you each to consider and explore further within your own contexts.

In closing, I would like to offer five suggestions for guiding principles related to the scholarship of teaching for you to consider in your individual contexts.

1. Choose your focus carefully

If you are going to investigate an area of your teaching and/or your students' learning, one related to your institution's foci would be ideal as this would provide some alignment between individual, institutional and national quality assurance since the latter two are likely to be aligned to some extent. And if your institution's promotion policies are aligned with national priorities, a careful choice of where you put your improvement efforts should also contribute positively to your career advancement.

2. Connect to existing knowledge

It almost goes without saying that you should consult existing peer-reviewed literature on higher education teaching and learning, as well as considering other existing literature and resources in your specific area of interest. This will inform and guide your thinking and efforts to ensure you are building on a solid base of understanding.

3. Conduct rigorous investigations

Ideally, your investigation will be guided by clear, articulated research questions, carried out with meticulous adherence to appropriate methodology that incorporates valid and reliable measures of the variables you are considering, and will result in faithfully reported findings, including those that may not be palatable or easy to explain. In other words, the principles of high quality research should infuse all scholarship of teaching endeavours. The ethical dimensions of using students as the site for investigation need careful thought in particular.

4. Close the loop

Ensuring a feedback loop – to yourself, to your students, to your colleagues and to the university, both of the findings of your investigation and of the efforts you have made to act on them, will ensure the scholarship of teaching in which you are engaging is not just an end in itself. Teaching practice should be enhanced, both for the individual

conducting the scholarly investigation, and for those who have participated in the critique of that investigation.

5. *Communicate effectively*

Share what you have learnt in scholarly fora. Aim for international peer-reviewed journals as avenues of communication, as well as other options, such as teaching circles, the development and strategic use of teaching academy, the web publishing of case studies and the like.

Concluding remarks

The policy environment in relation to teaching in Australian higher education has begun to change and it is likely that an increasing focus on the scholarship of teaching, already evident in many Australian universities, will prevail, at least in the short-to-medium term. It is up to each university, and each teaching academic, to determine to what extent they will engage with these shifts.

Acknowledgement: I would like to thank Connie Yeun, Research Assistant at the Centre for the Study of Higher Education at the University of Melbourne, for her assistance with gathering some of the references for this paper.

References

- Asmar, C. (2002). Strategies to enhance learning and teaching in a research-extensive university. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 7(1), 18-29.
- Australian Universities Quality Agency (AUQA). (2007). *Report on an Audit of the University of the Sunshine Coast*. AUQA, Australia.
- Baldwin, G. (2006). *Personal Communication*. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, Melbourne.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered*. San Francisco, CA: Carnegie Foundation and Jossey-Bass.
- Bruff, D. (2007). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)*, Vanderbilt University Center for Teaching. 2007, http://www.vanderbilt.edu/cft/resources/teaching_resources/theory/sotl.htm, Accessed 7 May, 2007.
- Cerbin, W. (1996). Inventing a New Genre: The Course Portfolio at the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse. In P. Hutchings, *Making Teaching Community Property* pp52-56. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Cross, K. P. (1990). Teachers as Scholars. *IAAHE Bulletin* 43 (4), 3-5

- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/> Accessed 3 May, 2007.
- Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, (2007).
<http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au>, Accessed 12 May, 2007.
- Dallat, J., and Rae, G. (1993). Teacher training for university teachers? In R. Ellis (Ed.),
Quality Assurance for University Teaching. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Department of Education Science and Training. (2003). *Our Universities: Backing
 Australia's Future*.
http://www.backingaustraliasfuture.gov.au/policy_paper/contents.htm Accessed 6
 March, 2006.
- Department of Education Science and Training. (2005a). *Building University Diversity:
 Future approval and accreditation processes for Australian higher education*.
 Canberra.
- Department of Education Science and Training. (2005b). *Carrick Institute for Learning
 and Teaching in Higher Education: Mission, Objectives, Values*.
<http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/pid/10> Accessed 3 February, 2006.
- Department of Education, Science and training (DEST). (2007) *Learning and Teaching
 Performance Fund*
[.http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/policy_issues_reviews/key_issue
 s/learning_teaching/ltpf/2007ltpf.htm](http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/policy_issues_reviews/key_issues/learning_teaching/ltpf/2007ltpf.htm), Accessed 12 May, 2007.
- Devlin, M. (2003). A solution-focused model for improving individual university
 teaching. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8(1-2), 77-89.
- Goodyear, P., and Hativa, N. (2002). Introduction. In N. Hativa and P. Goodyear (Eds.),
Teacher Thinking, Beliefs and Knowledge in Higher Education (pp. 1-13).
 Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Glassick, C., Taylor Huber, M., and Maeroff, G. I. (1997). *Scholarship Assessed: A
 Special Report on Faculty Evaluation*. Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.
- Healey, M. (2000). Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: A
 Discipline-based Approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2),
 169-189.
- Hutchings, P. Bjork, C. and Babb, M. (2002). *The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
 in Higher Education: An Annotated Bibliography*. The Carnegie Academy for the
 Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and The Carnegie Foundation for the

Advancement of Teaching.

- Kane, R., Sandretto, S., and Heath, C. (2002). Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics. *Review of Educational Research*, 72(2), 177-228.
- Knapper, C., and Piccinin, S. (1999). *Using Consultants to Improve Teaching, New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (Vol. 79). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kreber, C. and Cranton, P. A. (2000). Exploring the Scholarship of Teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71 (4), 476-495.
- Martin, E., Benjamin, J., Prosser, M., and Trigwell, K. (1999). Scholarship of Teaching: A Study of the Approaches of Academic Staff. in C. Rust (ed.). *Improving Student Learning: Improving Student Learning Outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Learning and Development, Oxford Brookes University. pp. 326-331
- McKinney, K. (2004). The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning: Past Lessons, Current Challenges, and Future Visions. *To Improve the Academy*, 22. 3-19
- Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to Teach in Higher Education (2nd edition)*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Saroyan, A., Amundsen, C., McAlpine, L., Weston, C., Winer, L., and Gandell, T. (2004). Assumptions underlying workshop activities. In A. Saroyan and C. Amundsen (Eds.), *Rethinking Teaching in Higher Education* (pp. 15-29). Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.
- Shulman, L.S. (1999). Taking Learning Seriously. *Change*, 31(4). 10-17
- Shulman, L. S. and Hutchings, P. (1999). The Scholarship of Teaching: New Elaborations, New Developments. *Change*, September/October. 31 (5), 10-15.