

Beyond the classroom: The effect of institutional factors on scholarly teaching and learning innovations

Janice Catterall, University of Western Sydney, j.catterall@uws.edu.au

Abstract

One outcome of the massive structural changes that has characterised higher education in recent decades has been a proliferation of innovative teaching and learning responses initiated from within university programs. This paper examines long term outcomes for three subject-based teaching innovations that were initially successful in delivering improved teaching and learning outcomes, for successive cohorts of students. Yet, despite this success the projects were not sustained and four years after the projects began, only remnants of the original scholarly teaching and learning practices remained. The research study reported in this paper examined the work and perceptions of key players in the three project teams to explore some of the dynamics that may account for the demise of these teaching innovations. The focus is an examination of the impact that forces outside the classroom have had on the quality of teaching and learning, in particular the effect that changing political and institutional agendas have had on innovation in the classroom.

This article has been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication in *SLEID*, an international journal of scholarship and research that supports emerging scholars and the development of evidence-based practice in education.

© Copyright of articles is retained by authors. As an open access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings.
ISSN 1832-2050

Introduction

Teaching innovation is costly. Identifying a problem in the classroom, coping with students disconnected from their learning, trying to replace tired pedagogical practices with a more inclusive and engaged curriculum involves money, time and emotional and physical labour. In an earlier paper (Catterall, 2003) I optimistically suggested that curriculum changes that were securely founded in good teaching and learning scholarship would almost certainly be successful and this was borne out by very positive student evaluations. But success is very different to sustainability and in these times of scarce resources and strict accountability, it is important that educators get optimum mileage out of innovations that have often been realised at considerable financial and emotional cost.

The three projects described in this paper were collaborative teaching projects between subject specialists and learning developers. The projects were conducted in a large metropolitan university in Australia commencing in the period 2000–2001. The precise nature of the relationship is described in more detail later but in each case the subject specialist identified issues related to student preparedness for study within the unit they coordinated and requested input from experts in academic literacy development located within the university Learning Unit.

Background

Academic literacies

Collaborative teaching partnerships between subject specialists and learning developers have become increasingly commonplace as the importance of embedding literacy and other graduate attributes in content areas has become more widely recognised. Fraser (2006) reminds us that while academics are often active within their own disciplinary research community, it can be difficult to also maintain currency in literature related to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Higher education learning developers who are familiar with teaching and learning research can form partnerships with subject specialists that are advantageous for a number of reasons. Benjamin (2000), for instance, refers to the scholarship of teaching in teams to promote the advantages of sharing new or untried ideas, and being able to engage in reflection about theory and practice. Quinlan (2000) also, in her study of department-based collaborative academic development, found shared reflections on learning to be an ingredient of success but warned that “ownership” of the project by the faculty academics in the partnership was critical. In a further useful explication of the benefits of collaborative partnerships, McAlpine and Harris (1999) describe how these relationships can bring together the explicit subject knowledge of the subject specialist and the explicit pedagogical knowledge of the academic developer creating a new language of explicit pedagogical content knowledge that can then be used to communicate new ideas and practices to colleagues.

The focus on collaborative pedagogies has also been taken up in the form of attention to discourse communities or “communities of practice” (Lea, 2005). This framework is useful to the study described in this paper as a tool to critique the practices within the disciplinary areas in which the projects are situated. In particular this lens allows us to consider the impact on projects when certain members of the university community are marginalised or excluded.

For those involved in teaching academic literacy, teaching partnerships with content specialists are particularly important. In recent years the notion that the academic literacy of “weak” students can be developed through “bolt on” approaches such as generic study skills workshops has been largely discredited (Wingate, 2006). It is similarly unlikely that the reading and writing necessary for higher education study could be developed effectively in generalist pre-tertiary courses. Lea (2004, p. 741) draws our attention to a large body of research into academic literacies that contests earlier beliefs that access can be gained to a “relatively homogenous” academy by learning common cultural practices. Instead writing is viewed as a social practice that is tied to the context of the discipline area in which the student is studying (Lea & Street, 1998). It is crucial therefore, that learning developers are able to embed academic literacy development in the context of specific subject areas. To do this effectively they often must rely on the subject knowledge of content specialists. Similarly, since writing is essential “for the understanding and construction of subject-based knowledge” (Berkenkotter & Huckin, 1995, cited in Wingate, 2006, p. 461) content specialists, who are not expert in the teaching of writing, often rely on teaching partnerships with learning developers. Hence the mutually beneficial teaching partnerships described by McAlpine and Harris (1999). In many ways the three partnerships described in this paper have taken up the challenge, set by Lea (p. 740), to integrate understandings delivered by the academic literacies approach, about the complex relationship between reading, writing and learning, into the curriculum of mainstream course delivery.

Innovation

In the five years since the original interviews took place there has been renewed interest in the notion of innovation and the degree to which innovations can be deemed successful. For the purposes of this paper the changes to teaching and learning practices evident in the three case studies will be considered innovations because they were characterised by ideas and processes that transformed the current practice within the subject (Southwell, Gannaway, Orrell, Chalmers, & Abraham, 2005, p. 17). The long term success of innovations is often talked about in terms of “scale up” and sustainability. According to Coburn (2003), the term “scale” can be applied to changes that exhibit a number of key features. The change must bring about a change, not just in the way teaching materials or classrooms are organised but must enact change in the pedagogical principles on which the curriculum is based. In addition for a project to have scale there must be elements of “spread” beyond the original site and ownership must shift from the external to the internal. However, for Coburn (2003), the central platform of scale is sustainability. The change must be able to survive shifts in institutional priorities, teacher turnover and the frustration of administrative obstacles. It is this notion of sustainability that provides the most relevant lens through which to view the success of projects described in this study.

The three projects described in this study could be viewed as grass roots projects because they were conceived out of the unit coordinators’ desire to improve teaching and learning within the single subject for which they were responsible. It is difficult to predict whether the outcomes of the projects would have been different had they been part of curriculum reform on a much grander scale. There has been significant research this decade into the optimum conditions for sustaining and disseminating larger scale educational innovations. Two important contributions have been made by projects commissioned by the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. As part of a wide ranging literature review, McKenzie, Alexander, Harper, & Anderson, (2005) identified aspects that supported adaptation, implementation and embedding of projects including supportive leadership, support for the innovation including academic development support and the perception that teaching innovation was valued. Barriers included high workloads, lack of time and policy and technical blocks. Southwell et al. (2005) used literature and project analysis to identify five conditions critical for effective up scaling of innovations including effective multi-layered leadership, institutional readiness for change, availability of resources and comprehensive communication and quality systems in both institutions and funding bodies. de la Harpe and Radloff (2006) used the conditions provided by these frameworks, among others, to evaluate three projects aimed at developing subject specific graduate attributes. Although the projects evaluated were larger scale than the projects described in this paper, a number of the recommendations are pertinent to the single subject projects, particularly those related to the importance of leadership and dissemination of outcomes.

Institutional context

One frame that seems to have been given insufficient attention in discussions related to successful teaching and learning models over the last decades has been the potential impact on innovations of the wider institutional climate. Lea (2005, p. 182) for example, notes that neither social constructivist models nor the phenomenographic traditions that characterised interpretations of student learning in the 1990s took account of the “broader institutional context in shaping learning and teaching.” Kemmis (2006) recognises similar omissions when he labels as inadequate some forms of contemporary action research that seek to improve

practices or techniques of teaching without reference to, or critique of, broader educational conditions. Ivanic and Lea (2006) believe that understanding the current educational context in the UK has critical implications for interpreting issues in teaching and learning. The repercussions of massification, in particular, are pertinent to the Australian context because larger class sizes, less face-to-face contact with students, and higher administrative demands are factors that can impact innovation in the classroom. One of the advantages of re-examining data from projects that were initiated in 2000–2001 is that some of the institutional factors at play in this period have been more clearly enunciated in the literature and therefore are more open to the kind of critique to which Kemmis alludes.

To gain a broader understanding of the key institutional factors that have been operating in the higher education environment in the past decades it is useful to turn to researchers who have considered the impact of these forces on teachers and managers. It is beyond the scope of this paper to speculate whether male lecturers would have experienced the same impact on their teaching as the women in this study. Suffice to say that because the participants in these projects were female, literature that considers the impact of institutional forces on female teachers is particularly relevant. Kenway and Langmead (2002) have described six different types of “governmentality” that have resulted in dramatic change in Australian tertiary institutions over the last decade. Themes particularly relevant to the projects described in this paper are rationalisation or downsizing which has resulted in increased casualisation of the workforce, corporatisation of university governance and marketisation with its ‘user pay’ principles. Blackmore and Sachs (2007, p. 19) have highlighted the emotional impact of organisational change, in particular the effects on educators who “view education as a site of social action and change, as a political act.” Blackmore and Sachs (p. 19) also refer to the “reprivatisation of care and work” which has made it harder for women to balance the responsibilities of home and work and the contradictions between the “family friendly” universities and the “greedy organisations that demand more for less and actively undermine women’s work as they intensify labour, casualise work, practice increased surveillance and demand compliance.”

It is this last issue of compliance that Morley (2003) believes has emerged from the quality assurance process, another agenda that has dominated the Australian tertiary sector this decade. For most participants in the projects described in this paper the innovations were affected, sometimes overtly, by preparation for and participation in the Australian Universities Quality Assurance (AUQA) review process. Blackmore and Sachs (2007) have found a tension between performativity, which they describe as “performing well according to a set of regulatory principles and the passion for ‘doing good’ in educational work” based on a desire to enact principles of social justice and equity.

Description of projects

The three projects described in this paper involved collaborations between a unit co-ordinator and a lecturer from the Learning Skills Unit (LSU). The projects, initiated in the period 2000–2001, were broadly aimed at improving teaching and learning in order to achieve more successful outcomes for students. Each of the units was delivered to between four hundred and five hundred students at a time. Project A was situated in the disciplinary area of Sociology, Project B in Business and Project C in Science. In all three projects the unit coordinator was responsible for a teaching team of between three and ten other staff made up of both permanent and casual staff. The site in which the projects took place was a university that in this period was described as a ‘New Generation’ university with relatively large

numbers of students from recognised equity categories, who in many cases were the first in family to attend a tertiary institution. The units were taught over two to four campuses each separated by a thirty minute to one hour drive by car. The unit coordinators and the lecturers from the Learning Unit were all female. By 2007 Project B was defunct and both staff involved had left the university. Projects A and C had significantly changed and even though similar units had survived as part of the degree structure, the teaching and learning innovations, that were part of the original study, had largely disappeared.

Data collection and analysis

There were three stages of data collection; initial and follow-up semi structured interviews and analysis of documents related to the teaching and learning process. Initial detailed interviews were conducted in 2003 with the three unit coordinators and the two Learning Unit lecturers with whom they were working. In this tertiary context a unit is one subject of a program or degree course. One Learning Unit lecturer was involved with two of the projects. Since all three projects involved the development of student learning resources, I was also able to collect and analyse a student resource booklet for each project as well as teaching notes and resources that were developed for other lecturers teaching on the units. These materials were useful in verifying the impressions of the project teams related to the perceived focus on student learning and the quality of information that was provided to other members of the teaching teams. All the interview material was transcribed and entered into NVIVO, a qualitative software program. Using NVIVO, data were coded and common themes were identified.

Findings

Embedded student centred innovations

All three projects were conceived out of a belief that there was a mismatch between the preparedness of the students undertaking the units and the way in which the units were delivered. This mismatch was being reflected in poor student retention and the perception that students were disengaged. In Project A the unit coordinator felt that the problems the students were having with writing the required assessment tasks stemmed from inexperience with reading academic texts. The teaching and learning innovation in this unit replaced the traditional content ‘only’ approach with a more structured approach where students had the opportunity to move from graded, selected readings to reflection and then to more objective writing.

In Project B the unit coordinator had inherited at short notice a business unit together with a unit outline that prescribed a series of lectures and tutorials. The coordinator reported that after six weeks the students were “asleep” or not attending and that she was feeling exhausted with the effort of trying to engage student interest. A brief questionnaire confirmed that students thought the unit was boring and irrelevant. At that point the coordinator abandoned the unit outline and brought in a problem-based approach in which students formed teams to deal with “real life” management issues.

The aim of Project C was to facilitate the process whereby students could own the difficult terminology associated with medical science by starting with the everyday language used to describe common health breakdowns within the students’ experiences. As in Project B, flexible, small group work was used to promote active learning.

Communities of Practice

Although all three unit coordinators expressed keen interest in teaching scholarship and had some past educational experience with teaching and learning theories, they generally felt that were out of date with current best practice and welcomed the opportunity to discuss the literature with lecturers they felt were expert in the field. All the participants in the project reported that there was frequent discussion in meetings about teaching and learning pedagogy which was then used to inform practice. Strong discussion themes that emerged from the interviews included commitment to principles of equity and social justice, to student-centred learning, a preference for experiential or problem-based learning, recognition of the importance of academic literacy development and the importance of opportunities for teacher and student reflection. There was a sense among all participants that they brought different strengths to the team, with the learning lecturers identifying their particular role as that of “sounding board” in addition to having the responsibility of sharing current perspectives from learning and teaching literature and being more familiar with strategies that could promote student engagement and academic literacy development.

However the close professional teaching relationships described by the participants in this study did not seem to extend to the wider unit teaching teams employed in the teaching of the units. In Project A and C most of the teaching team were described as supportive but in a fairly detached way since they were spread over four geographically separate campuses. Both unit coordinators reported that the innovation was hindered by the reluctance of at least one or two staff to understand or engage with the new pedagogy and the difficulty of having all teaching staff attend unit meetings, particularly casual staff. In Project A the innovation was initially keenly supported by the Head of Program but it was difficult to keep such a busy person ‘in the loop’ as the project progressed. In Project C the Head of Program, located on a different campus, was not really involved in the innovation, while for Project B the Head of Program was reported as being antagonistic to the change. This attitude was reflected by the wider unit teaching team who complained about the revised teaching program, in particular about the increased workload associated with the change. In the most extreme example of the absence of a community of teaching practice, the unit coordinator reported trying to engage senior colleagues in discussion about student learning at a formal meeting and was told to take her concerns to a small, marginalised Faculty teaching and learning group.

So what I had was from a group of colleagues who basically weren't interested, who sent me off to a local forum which had a network that went outside the place. I guess the way I operate is if the people around me aren't interested in my things, then I will go and create a group that works together. (Unit Coordinator, Project B)

Although the unit coordinators in Projects A and C did not face such concerted opposition from their wider teaching colleagues, it was clear that lack of time, geographic distance and casualisation made it difficult for fruitful discussions about teaching and learning to regularly occur.

Institutional factors

All the participants in this study reported extremely heavy workloads. The duties associated with the coordination of the units in this study formed only a part of the overall academic workload. For the units in this study the coordinators chose to add the development of a new curriculum to the already onerous task of coordinating

teaching staff and students across a number of campuses. Although development of teaching resources was shared with the Learning Unit, all three unit coordinators reported using evening and weekend time to develop their parts of the teaching resources.

I didn't have time during regular time so I used to start at 9.00 at night and finish at 4 in the morning and that's why we got a [student resource] book. (Unit Coordinator)

The project teams hoped that the development of detailed teaching and learning resources would reduce the workload during the teaching of the unit. Examination of the teaching resources certainly revealed that all three units provided comprehensive teaching and learning notes to both students and teaching staff. These booklets included readings, specific advice about unit assessment genres, models of successful writing, detailed marking criteria, and suggestions for teaching strategies. Unit coordinators reported that staff found these resources useful, particularly those who were not trained as teachers and who had had limited exposure to a wide variety of teaching strategies. Nevertheless interviews suggest that the workload remained prohibitive.

The high workload for unit coordinators was exacerbated by the lack of commitment to the innovations by some permanent staff and the high degree of casualisation in the wider teaching team. Yet this lack of commitment was itself due, at least partly, to increases in the workload of the wider teaching team. There is no question that the change from the traditional lecture/large tutorial modes to the more student-centred approaches that scaffolded academic discourses, led to an increase in teacher workload. If, for example, the unit teaching teams were to understand the pedagogy on which the innovations were based they would have had to attend numerous team meetings. After all, the project teams had discussed this literature and its ramifications in regular meetings over a semester or more. There was little funding to pay for casual staff to attend meetings. In some cases members of the wider teaching team failed to grasp the theoretical underpinnings of the innovations and this had serious ramifications for the long term sustainability of the project. One example of this was related to the embedded relationship between subject matter and writing, with a few staff reportedly feeling that content had been sacrificed to make way for writing development that students should already have mastered. Then there was extra marking. In order to facilitate the development of writing, students were given a number of opportunities to submit writing for feedback. Unit coordinators admitted that this conflicted with a general university policy to “assess less.”

Unit coordinators reported instances where members of their unit teaching team made little use of the teaching resources that had been developed, failed to show students that they valued the student resource booklet, over relied on the more basic model answers provided or failed to notify students of additional literacy support when it was made available. A few staff felt the expected workload was too high and in one case referred complaints to the Head of Program. The fact that the marking load was higher than ‘allowable’ was particularly problematic as was the difficulty of trying to ensure marking comparability. Staff in the wider teaching teams reportedly found marking of “new genres like reflective journals very difficult” and this created extra work in meetings and moderation for the unit coordinators.

The common response to these difficulties on the part of the unit coordinators was to “work harder” to sell the curriculum innovations.

A description by one of the learning lecturers sums up the general predicament of the unit coordinators.

When things got tricky she would respond by working harder and wearing everyone down. It took ages: meetings would go on for most of the day. They had to give in to her superior arguments and ideas. It did mean, however, that she did an enormous amount of extra work, from organising people's teaching materials, to doing and re-doing their marking. There were times when she seemed exhausted and frustrated, but the mission to create a better learning experience for the students always prevailed. (Learning Unit lecturer)

One of the more serious implications of the excessive workload experienced by the unit coordinators was the lack of attention to evaluation and dissemination of the project outcomes. Students in all three units completed questionnaires, at least at the completion of the unit, and coordinators reported that the response to the way the units were taught was overwhelmingly favourable. When interviewed, the unit coordinators quoted many anecdotal examples of student satisfaction and success. However only in Project B was the response published in a formal way outside the immediate teaching team and this only after the unit coordinator had already been relieved of responsibility for the subject. The positive outcomes over a number of years for students who enrolled in the units in Project A and Project C were really only shared informally among the immediate project teams.

The work was so huge, coordinating across two, then four campuses; I didn't put enough work into evaluating. ... I didn't really have enough time to develop a formal evaluation process, to get it written up. I still have the student evaluations and the feedback from the first four years that the tutors had written but I wasn't able to be as focused or strategic because of the absolute workload. (Unit Coordinator)

Although each of the projects apparently delivered successful outcomes for students in the periods they operated, there were still a number of other institutional changes that impacted negatively the teaching programs during the life of the projects. The change, on economic grounds, to more hours of lectures and less of tutorials, meant that the use of the student resource booklets, focusing on explicit assessment advice and academic literacy, increasingly became homework rather than in-class exercises. Similarly academic literacy support moved to an adjunct mode aimed at 'struggling students'. These sessions were extremely difficult to timetable and many students experienced difficulty in attending. In one project the problems of ensuring marking comparability became overwhelming and extended writing assessments were replaced by online short answer tests. The projects were increasingly perceived as too expensive as cost cutting became a primary institutional activity.

Discussion

Teaching is a dynamic activity and many would consider the three to five year life of these projects to have been an adequate, even exemplary outcome. Certainly the focus on student-centred learning was reportedly successful for successive cohorts of students. Yet many of the curriculum changes were slowly eroded even in the short term and subsequent revisions of the units failed to replicate the original high level of student engagement or the provision for integrated writing development.

Focus on scholarship

The teaching partnerships did reflect some key elements of scholarly teaching practice. As Fraser (2006) predicted, the input of the learning lecturers was highly valued by the unit coordinators as a means through which they could reacquaint themselves with current teaching and learning literature and ensure that their innovations reflected best practice. The contributions of the different team members meant that an explicit pedagogical content knowledge was created to provide a framework for the new teaching and learning resources (McAlpine & Harris, 1999). Examination of the teaching resources provided numerous examples of this ‘new’ metalanguage. In addition, the role of the learning lecturers as ‘sounding boards’ for new ideas did indeed reduce the isolation that the unit coordinators might otherwise have felt and ensured that there could be reflection on theory and practice (Benjamin, 2000). It was clear in the interviews that the project team members formed a small but vital teaching community.

In hindsight, however, the exclusion of the wider teaching teams from the “community of practice” was a serious problem. Lea (2005) suggests that it is relevant to consider which participants were excluded from the community of practice and why? Through either a lack of interest or the impost of institutional barriers such as excessive time and cost, the wider teaching teams were not part of the “creative” phase of the projects. Although it was promising that the innovation was firmly “owned” by the department-based member of the team (Quinlan, 2000), the high level commitment did not extend beyond the unit coordinator. A lack of understanding of the pedagogical framework by teaching team members led to complaints and erosion of good practice. For instance when institutional changes led to the reduction in tutorial time, it was decided to abandon activities related to writing development which some members of the teaching teams mistakenly believed could be developed generically or in adjunct modes. The learning lecturers interviewed reported that the wider teaching teams were sometimes resentful that content had been sacrificed for activities that were perceived as less important or even unrelated to the unit such as reflective discussion, group work or explicit writing instruction. Yet in the eyes of the project teams these developments were the central planks of the project. It should be remembered that many of the wider teaching teams were casual staff, usually without teaching qualifications and who were not remunerated for attending meetings. Permanent staff were often overburdened with their own unit coordination responsibilities. Finally, and perhaps the most serious shortcoming in terms of scholarship, was the inability of the unit coordinators to find time to undertake the evaluation and dissemination of outcomes that might have persuaded the teaching teams and the Heads of Program that the changes to the curriculum were worth the additional time and cost.

Focus on Institutional Factors

The potential for one unit coordinator to bring about long term curriculum change might have been more sustainable if the units had had smaller student cohorts and smaller but permanently employed teaching teams who could have been more involved in regular project meetings during the development phase. But praise for the relative ease with which teachers can design and redesign their own classrooms does little to address the reality facing many university programs today. One of the effects of massification has been an increasing shift to large core first year units and it is the learning experiences of these large cohorts that universities, concerned about the quality of the first year experience should be addressing (James, 2007). Neither is it likely that programs such as these will be able to improve their ratio of permanent staff to casual staff. The experiences of the unit coordinators in this study were typical of the experiences identified by Kenway and Langmead (2002,

p. 103) who believe that one of the key outcomes of rationalisation has been the paradox that the employment of a greater percentage of casual staff has increased the workloads of permanent staff.

Perhaps we should not be surprised that these projects had a few years of successful outcomes followed by decline as the hard working and passionate innovators became ‘burnt out’. After all much of the resource development took place at night and on weekends after the ‘normal’ workload had been completed. The female academics who featured in the studies of Acker and Armenti (2004) as stressed, overworked, sleep deprived and candidates for illness had many parallels to the unit coordinators in this study. It is not surprising that projects conceived and carried out on the back of ‘additional to workload’ work could not be sustained for more than a couple of years. The women in this study were fiercely committed to quality teaching and learning as the means to ensure equitable outcomes for their largely ‘non traditional’ student base; however, there was little recognition nor reward reported for this commitment to access and equity. Blackmore and Sachs (2007) go further and suggest that the commitment to social justice and equity might be incompatible with the climate of performativity that has characterised universities this decade.

During the years that the projects were operating, the university was preparing to participate in the Australian Universities Quality Assurance (AUQA) review process. The university institutional climate in these years reflected an emphasis on fiscal responsibility, efficiency, and quality as demonstrated through measurable outcomes. It is perhaps not surprising that these projects with their sound but relatively costly curricula and unheralded outcomes, did not measure up.

Conclusion

The three projects in this study were successful teaching innovations that improved the teaching and learning environment for successive cohorts of students. In an ideal institution these innovations would have continued to evolve, adapting to the changing higher education environment with enhancements that continued to place students at the centre of the teaching and learning endeavour. The failure of these projects to be sustained in the long term has implications for the practices of both teaching teams and their managers.

First, it is important that teaching teams engage in thorough planning processes that take account of critical issues in higher education, allowing potential impediments to be dealt with proactively and ensuring that final project stages of evaluation and dissemination are enacted. It may be advantageous to adopt key principles from the project management literature and set clear goals with accompanying timelines in the planning stages of the project. Examining potential challenges such as heavy workloads and communication barriers ahead of time would have allowed these project teams to implement more effective strategies. For example, regular meetings timetabled at the beginning of the project would have ensured greater attention to discussion of key issues of pedagogy as well as facilitated more systematic monitoring of tasks. Clear delineation of roles and responsibilities would have ensured that the projects in this study met key project outcomes that could then have been used to justify continued use of scarce teaching resources.

The employment of sound project management practices could also have helped win the ongoing support of managers. This support could have been crucial in mitigating the often negative effects that forces of marketisation and massification are having inside the classroom. Senior managers could have contributed to the

longevity of these projects through the timely appointment of unit coordinators and experienced casual staff, provision of funds to cover additional marking loads and support to disseminate project outcomes among the wider Faculty teaching communities. Effective project management and support of senior leadership would seem to be key factors in sustaining teaching innovation in higher education classrooms.

References

- Acker, S., & Armenti, C. (2004). Sleepless in academia. *Gender and Education*, 16(1), 3–24.
- Benjamin, J. (2000). The scholarship of teaching in teams: What does it look like in practice? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 191–204.
- Blackmore, J., & Sachs, J. (2007). *Performing and reforming leaders*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Catterall, J. (2003). *The teaching partnership as one vehicle for educational innovation*. Paper presented at the Education Research Conference, University of Western Sydney.
- Coburn, C. (2003). Rethinking scale: Moving beyond numbers to deep and lasting change. *Educational Researcher*, 32(6), 3–20.
- dela Harpe, B., & Radloff, A. (2006). Lessons learned from three projects to design learning environments that support 'generic' skill development. *Journal of Learning Design*, 1(2), 21–34.
- Fraser, S. P. (2006). Shaping the university curriculum through partnerships and critical conversations. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 11(1), 5–17.
- Ivanic, R., & Lea, M. R. (2006). New contexts, new challenges: the teaching of writing in UK higher education. In L. Ganobcsik-Williams (Ed.), *Teaching academic writing in UK higher education*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- James, R. (2007). Students and student learning in mass systems of higher education: Six educational issues facing universities and academic leaders. Paper prepared for *Mass higher education in UK and International contexts*, Seminar Three, 29–30 May, Surrey.
- Kemmis, S. (2006). Participatory action research and the public sphere. *Educational Action Research*, 14(4), 459–476.
- Kenway, J., & Langmead, D. (2002). Is there a future for feminism in the contemporary university? In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women and school leadership* (pp. 129–146). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Lea, M. R. (2004). Academic literacies: Pedagogy for course design. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(6), 739–756.
- Lea, M. R. (2005). 'Communities of practice' in higher education: useful heuristic or educational model. In D. Barton & K. Tustling (Eds.), *Beyond communities of practice* (pp. 180–197). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lea, M. R., & Street, B. (1998). Student writing in higher education: an academic literacies approach. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(2).
- McAlpine, L., & Harris, R. (1999). Lessons learned: Faculty developer and engineer working as faculty development colleagues. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 4(1).
- McKenzie, J., Alexander, S., Harper, C., & Anderson, S. (2005). *Dissemination, adoption & adaptation of project innovations in higher education*. Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.
- Morley, L. (2003). *Quality and power in higher education*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

- Quinlan, K. (2000). Making a difference through department-based collaborative development. *HERDSA News*, 8(10).
- Southwell, D., Gannaway, D., Orrell, J., Chalmers, D., & Abraham, C. (2005). *Strategies for effective dissemination of project outcomes*. Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education.
- Wingate, U. (2006). Doing away with 'study skills'. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 11(4), 457–469.