

CHRISTOPHER KLOPPER AND STEVE DREW

1. TEACHING FOR LEARNING AND LEARNING FOR TEACHING

Cases in Context of Peer Review of Teaching in Higher Education

INTRODUCTION

Teaching for learning and learning for teaching focuses on the emerging global governmental and institutional agenda about higher education teaching quality and the role that peer review can play in supporting improvements in teaching and student outcomes. This agenda is a pervasive element of the further development of higher education internationally through activities of governments, global agencies, institutions of higher education, discrete disciplines, and individual teachers. Over the past fifteen years, there has been a rapidly expanding global marketplace for higher education to service burgeoning demand for desirable forms of work and those of advanced industrial economies (Klopper and Drew, 2013). In such a competitive climate, it is imperative that the education products and services offered are clearly differentiated to market needs globally, regionally, and locally (Jones & Oleksiyenko, 2011; Marginson et al., 2011); and that they are of an outstanding quality in terms of access (Morley, 2012; Rizvi & Lingard, 2011), processes and outcomes (Wong, 2012). Many universities have adopted student evaluations as a mechanism to appraise the quality of teaching. These evaluations can be understood as providing a “customer-centric” portrait of quality; and, when used as the sole arbiter of teaching performance they do not instil confidence in the system of evaluation by academic teaching staff. Providing peer perspectives as counterpoint, whether in a developmental or summative form, goes some way to alleviating this imbalance and is the impetus for the resurgence of interest in peer review and observation of teaching. This book seeks to recognise cases of context of peer review of teaching in Higher Education to affirm best practices and identify areas that require improvement in establishing local, national international benchmarks of teaching quality.

CONSTITUENTS OF GOOD TEACHING

There are several examples of constituents of good teaching (Klopper and Drew, 2013; Drew and Klopper, in press 2014). A nexus with teaching and research created the new terms “scholarly teaching” (Glassick, 2000b) and “scholarship of teaching” (Boyer, 1990; Hutchings & Shulman, 1999; Trigwell, Martin, Benjamin, & Prosser, 2000) that illuminate good teaching and suggest means for its attainment. Many universities now recognise the scholarship of teaching as contributing to

research output, and reward evidence of excellence in teaching. Evidence of a scholarly approach to teaching emerges as academic teaching staff members engage in professional activities reflecting of their teaching (Schon & DeSanctis, 1986). Academic staff engaged in action research (Kemmis, 2006; Zuber-Skerritt, 1992) to develop curricula and pedagogical techniques for their teaching can obtain outstanding results and create classes that are instructive to observe. This is the essence of the scholarship of teaching (Boyer, 1990, p23-24) where “pedagogical procedures must be carefully planned, continuously examined, and relate directly to the subject taught”.

Many governments define a quality agenda and develop policy regarding higher education standards and how quality is measured, developed, and maintained (QAA, 2012; TEQSA, 2012). In some countries different industries (AACSB, 2012; ABET, 2012) or national and regional associations (AAHEA, 2012; BCEQA, 2012) accredit universities that meet their distinct quality needs. In the Australian context the government’s Tertiary Education Quality Standards Agency (TEQSA) evaluates private and public higher education providers against its Higher Education Standards Framework. The framework provides and develops standards relating to provider organizations, the nature of learning underpinning the awarding of qualifications, quality of teaching and learning, quality of research, and quality of information provided to stakeholders (TEQSA, 2012).

Hence, in a competitive field the need for developing enhanced practice and outcomes becomes a key driver, moving from quality assurance to quality enhancement. Biggs (2001) builds upon the notion of a reflective practitioner (Schön, 1983) to provide a model for “prospective quality” to promote a reflective organization. Such an institution instantiates a comprehensive quality model, a process for continuous improvement and creates an environment in which quality enhancement, is feasible.

TEACHING FOR LEARNING AND LEARNING FOR TEACHING

This book is conceived against this background and showcases a University wide initiative of Peer Review and Observation of Teaching (PRO-Teaching) which explored the potential for the peer review of teaching to enhance teaching practice and the learning outcomes of students to address the perceived need to improve teaching quality (teaching for learning), provide opportunities for academic staff to improve their understanding of effective teaching (learning for teaching) and enact a scholarship of learning and teaching.

Scholarly teaching is defined in this book as the interface from teaching to learning such that academic teaching staff members consult relevant educational literature as well as the pedagogical content knowledge to consistently enhance their teaching practice. Teaching includes the design and implementing of activities that promote learning, and includes direct classroom teaching, course design, development of instructional materials, and development of formative and summative assessment. Scholarly teaching and undertaking a scholarship of

MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

teaching do not necessarily indicate excellent teaching for learning but this book signals an approach that has the capacity to enhance teaching practice and inform others as they seek to improve theirs through learning for teaching.

Readers will be engaged with the Most Significant Change technique (Dart & Davies, 2003) as the contributors present cross-disciplinary participatory action research case studies detailing significant domains of change in participants' teaching practices and capturing the significant change points in understandings and operations. The domains of change promoting the generation of knowledge from this university wide project include: active participatory contribution associated with teaching for learning and learning for teaching, pedagogical methods and tools and the sustainability of the PRO-Teaching mechanism within an organization. These domains of change have provided the architecture for this book, which comprises an overview section and three subsequent sections each detailing respective domains of change.

The overview section describes the context and the competitive requirement for quality enhancements for teaching and learning in higher education. It previews the major perspectives of the book through the presentation of a process for the peer review and observation of teaching and the subsequent contributions made by each chapter to these perspectives. The next section of the book, *Active participatory contribution associated with teaching for learning and learning for teaching*, comprises a collection of chapters detailing explicit cases of context where peer review of teaching occurred. These chapters position both local and global perspectives in relation to quality assurance, quality feasibility and quality enhancement and bring together the work of colleagues to affirm best practices and identify the areas that require improvement in establishing international benchmarks of teaching quality. The next section of the book *Pedagogical methods and tools* draws together the descriptions, discussions, imperatives and processes outlined in the previous sections by furthering cases of context in a variety of pedagogical environments and settings. The final section of the book culminates with the presentation of an evaluation of the impact of the peer review of teaching in one Australian university by using the most significant change technique to highlight both the outcomes of a university wide project, and the effectiveness of the MSC technique. The book concludes with the presentation of the protocols for peer review of teaching implemented in the university to contribute to the global exemplary of practice to support national and international benchmarking of teaching quality in higher education.

CASES OF CONTEXT

In Chapter two Drew, Klopper and Nulty (this volume) discuss the main arguments that deal with defining, and developing an approach and framework for the peer observation of teaching. The purpose is to highlight the rich and extensive literature base that informed the identification of characteristics of effective teaching and led to the subsequent formulation of a hybrid instrument for use in peer observation of

teaching. The chapter presents the numerous design considerations that were taken into account concurrently to achieve a framework for implementation. The chapter concludes with the authors substantiating the comprehensive literature support for the applicability of the identified characteristics of effective teaching described in this chapter for the peer review of teaching.

Chapter three begins with a brief discussion of peer review of teaching in educational settings as a quality review and improvement tool. Next, the authors (Drew and Kloppe; this volume) look at the current contextual motivations and the relevant design process required. The chapter then presents the PRO-Teaching model and process. This provides the ground for a discussion on objective reporting prior to outlining an implementation strategy. The chapter concludes with a sharing of successes and limitations and the authors claim the effectiveness and credibility of the reliance on student evaluation as the sole judge of teaching quality.

Chapter four presents and explores one possible model for encouraging one-to-one teachers in conservatoires to reflect critically on their pedagogical choices and practices. It is the purpose of the authors (Carey and Grant; this volume) to highlight possible ways to develop 'best practice' models for one-to-one pedagogy that incorporate professional growth strategies for teachers. The chapter is structured as follows. After an overview of the literature on peer-assisted reflection in higher music education, including the use of video as a reflective tool, the authors position their research in the context of a broader ongoing project, *Transformative One-to-one Teaching and Learning*, at one Australian music institution. Next they report on a sub-project that used video as the basis for a collaborative reflective activity among teachers at this institution. In the last two sections of the chapter what the teachers learnt about their teaching practices through this process, and their experiences of undertaking the activity is reported on and discussed. They also consider several implications for teachers and institutions, and argue that peer-assisted reflective activities may progress teachers' understandings of their own approaches to teaching, encourage those teachers to improve those practices, and foster a supportive environment for one-to-one teachers to explore and improve their teaching.

In Chapter five the main arguments that deal with the underlying factors challenging the delivery of online aviation education in the tertiary sector are discussed (Kille, Bates, and Murray; this volume). The purpose is to highlight the needs of aviation students, teachers and industry in the delivery of online tertiary aviation education by pointing to experiences of a university teacher engaged in the PRO-teaching initiative. The chapter is structured as follows. After providing an overview of the scope of the study, we explore the issues and challenges affecting the delivery of online education in university professional pilot programs including; teacher education; the nature of work as a professional pilot; and pilot student expectations. Next a summary of the solutions and recommendations that emerged as a result of the peer observation process is offered. While the solutions relate to the specific case study, the solutions were derived from a critical examination of professional pilot training more generally. Thus, this section aims to offer

recommendations applicable to the development of online tertiary courses, which include a cohort of professional pilots or training pilots. Kille, Bates, and Murray (this volume) contend that online tertiary aviation education courses need to be adjusted to consider the needs of the student and industry by: (1) implementing action-based learning; (2) considering pedagogy before technology; and (3) embedding formative assessment. In the last section research implications for the future delivery of online tertiary aviation education are considered. The need for further development of appropriate teacher resources, and emphasise the importance of the PRO-Teaching initiative for online aviation educators is discussed.

Chapter six begins with a brief discussion of two competing teaching environments – the traditional lecture and flipped lecture. The peer review process is discussed in introduction to business law, a second year compulsory in an undergraduate business degree. The student and peer evaluation data, which supported a change in teaching practice from the traditional to the flipped lecture model, is presented. The chapter then examines the literature through a case study approach to describe the flipped lecture, from its operation across three cohorts over a twelve-month period to its subsequent peer review. The narrative is complemented by an analysis of student and peer data as well as the authors' (Cameron and Dickfos; this volume) experiences with the flipped lecture. The case study provides preliminary evidence that the flipped lecture is the preferred learning environment for students. The chapter concludes with the limitations of the case study considered along with suggestions for future research, followed by concluding remarks.

In Chapter seven a case study using peer observation of teaching as a vehicle for developing a scholarly approach to teaching and providing a data gathering framework to facilitate scholarship of learning and teaching is presented. It is anticipated that after reading this chapter you will encounter the process behind which a technological innovation was introduced into a first year computer science course and the role that peer observation of teaching played in this process. The authors (Venema, Drew and Lodge; this volume) follow the development of the innovation and its impact on student learning to illustrate how interdisciplinary teams can work together to create innovative solutions to enhance student learning by leveraging technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge. They conclude that engaging in cross-disciplinary peer observation of teaching provides a promising developmental process for educators.

In Chapter eight, Wright and Main (this volume) discuss the main arguments that explore how to develop high quality teaching practices through an action research cycle that is informed by a peer review of teaching process. The chapter highlights the importance for academic teaching staff to improve their pedagogy by analyzing available data from self-reflections, peer observations, and student feedback as a means to improve student engagement and outcomes. Wright and Main (this volume) present an overview of the scope of the need for quality teaching in higher education, and review the particular strengths of using an action research model together and a peer review of teaching model as an improvement model for teaching development. Next they offer a summary of their experience of using an action

research cycle together with a peer review of teaching within a second year marketing major compulsory course for a Bachelor of Business program. The chapter concludes with several implications considered for using this approach to improve teaching practice in a higher education setting and they argue that using an action research process facilitates an experimental approach to improving practice that is evidence driven and forms a continuing cycle of improvement.

Chapter nine reflects on the challenges associated with PRO-Teaching evaluation from a performing arts delivery position. The reflection is articulated from Hassall's (this volume) position of expertise that sits outside of educational teacher training delivery contexts and reflects on facilitation of a professional studies introductory acting class– *Introduction to Performance Skills 1108EDN* – an arts degree rather than an education degree course. The chapter acknowledges that there increasing global diversity offered to University student populations in arts training scholarship acknowledges that teaching in; professional studies and vocational educational fields is growing. Evaluation standards that identify and aim to enhance teaching delivery across diverse areas in creative practices are therefore essential to ensuring quality of teaching in the field. PRO-Teaching Evaluation challenges from a performance (theatre) technique delivery position concern assessment of embodied experiential and instinctual behavioural practice as learning. The chapter outlines the peculiarities of teaching into performance-learning disciplines wherein 'mastery of material is uncertain and even impossible' (Anderson-Rabern, 2010, p. 91) and as such hypothesises the difficulties inherent to teaching observation in performance disciplines in Arts Degree courses. The reflection anticipates opening up discourse relating to the model from a performance art training perspective. In posing questions applicable to this specific process, the discussion aims to contribute to the development of the PRO-Teaching evaluation criterion. The chapter proposes that performance training implies that formative approaches to learning are implicit to the embodied expression and performance as an event can be considered as 'already critical, political and marked by difference (Dolan, 1993, p. 418). Overall the chapter summarises how performance-learning facilitation focuses on the *doing of experiences* and as such developing knowledge and understanding evolves as a 'repetition-of-the-never-the-same' whereby 'the task is taken up over and over, while the particulars keep changing' (Schechner, 2002, p. ix). It is in this conflicting liminal space where the Peer Observee may also encounter challenges with the evaluation criterion. The chapter summarises the implications for alternatives to evaluation criterion that might best accommodate assessment of facilitation and delivery within creative arts scholarship.

A brief discussion of the processes and value of mentoring relationships in relation to existing literature of the field opens Chapter ten. The chapter follows with a report of the learning potential of a cross-generational, collegiate collaboration within a specific mentor/mentee partnership- a pedagogical case study of quality enhancement methods in a music education course. The chapter is developed further through reporting of how individual teaching experience, knowledge base and skills were synthesized to produce outcomes beyond the partners' expectations;

particularly the collaborative development of a specific purpose website which could be used to engage an entire cohort of students and teaching staff in real-time critique of students' performances. Barlett and Spicer (this volume) conclude with a discussion of ongoing refinement of the online system and the flow-on benefits for course monitoring and teaching-team involvement.

Chapter eleven features the challenges facing Science discipline academics by pointing to the need for a balance between the time devoted to research and scholarship. In this chapter, Creswell, Gregory and Watters (this volume) discuss the main arguments that deal with the issue of the reluctance of science academics to undertake prescriptive peer review of teaching. The chapter delivers an overview of the scope of the disengagement of Science academics with the peer review process and reviews in particular the contextual landscape of peer review of higher education in Australia. A summary of the hurdles preventing Science academics in higher education in Australia from participating in peer review of their teaching is presented. In the last two sections of the chapter the authors (Creswell, Gregory and Watters; this volume) consider the many benefits of peer review of teaching and also highlight the need for varied depth and quality of the peer review process dependent upon its intended purpose of application. They propose a more streamlined process that potentially facilitates the further development of a culture of peer review and scaffolding into future applications of PRO-Teaching.

Tolmie (this volume) in Chapter twelve discusses the main arguments that deal with the issue of a Conservatoire teaching tradition within a contemporary University environment reinvigorated by peer-review of teaching training. The purpose is to highlight the transition early career music academics may encounter by incorporating an auto-ethnographic example, while pointing to the large-class vs. one-to-one teaching tradition. The chapter adheres to the following structure. After contributing an overview of the scope of a musician-turned-academic career path, the conservatoire in context, music industry and My Life as a Musician (MLaaM) course; the author then reviews the one-to-one teaching and large-class teaching environment via an auto-ethnographic account of her PRO-Teaching and PACES experience. This is followed by a summary of teacher and student educational attitudes encountered within the MLaaM course resulting in a course revision. Finally in the last two sections Tolmie considers several implications for: the revision of the MLaaM course; and for early career academics new to large class teaching; and argue for the inclusion of PRO-Teaching programmes for such candidates.

In Chapter thirteen Williams (this volume) discusses the main arguments that deal with the issue of narrative pedagogy in large group teaching. It is his intention to feature the misnomer that the lecture is 'dead' by pointing to research and strategies to reveal opportunities for deep and active learning in large group settings. The chapter begins with an overview of the scope of large group teaching, which is reviewed with the particular characteristics, challenges and opportunities afforded by narrative pedagogy. Next a summary of the mechanics of delivering narrative pedagogy, including his original FACTS model is provided. Finally in the last two

sections of the chapter, the author considers several implications for a case study of the use of *Aesop's Fables* to teach a threshold concept of “politics as power”, and argue, first, that large group teaching offers unique scope for teacher-student and student-student engagement, and, second, that a narrative approach allows teachers to package potentially “troublesome concepts” in “aesthetically” pleasing parcels.

Klopper, Drew and Power (this volume) begin Chapter fourteen with an overview of the enhancement of teaching and learning in a higher education setting, facilitated by two enhancement initiatives. The initiatives of Peer Review of Teaching (PRO-Teaching) project and the Peer Assisted Course Enhancement Scheme (PACES) are offered as complementary cross-disciplinary team-implemented initiatives designed for enhancing the quality of teaching and curriculum design. The chapter concludes with the strong recommendation that the customisation of peer review of teaching projects to the needs of individual institutions and the call for further research is needed into the achievement of such implementations in additional university settings.

In Chapter fifteen Klopper (this volume) discusses the main arguments that deal with the issue of evaluating a PRO-Teaching project by applying the Most Significant Change (MSC) technique to this area of work. The chapter presents both the outcomes of the project, and the effectiveness of the MSC technique to evaluate projects, which cover such diversity and complexity of data sources. The chapter concludes with the proposal that PRO-Teaching, combined with the MSC technique, provides a viewpoint for observers and observees to discern pedagogical methods, tools and approaches for professional development. Both the process and outcome of PRO-Teaching has the potential to revitalise teaching materials, teaching aids and learning environments through multiple lenses.

The final chapter of this book, Chapter seventeen, is the collation of the protocols that were developed for the university wide initiative PRO-Teaching. The offering is as suggested blueprints but rather as starting points for individuals or institutions exploring the peer review of teaching. It is envisaged that this contribution to the global exemplary of practice will support both national and international benchmarking practices of teaching quality in higher education through the peer review of teaching.

The PRO-Teaching mechanism recollected in the case studies contained in this book demonstrate the capacity to collect data to inform the constructive alignment within teaching episodes, student perceptions of teaching quality and observer perceptions of teaching quality enhancement. Variations of the process have been developed and implemented in a range of teaching contexts including lectures, tutorials, workshops, 1-to-1-studio teaching and on-line course delivery. Over the duration of the project several academics have been awarded teaching excellence citations and awards at group, university and national levels using PRO-Teaching evidence of impact on teaching and learning quality enhancement.

Klopper and Drew (2013, p.142) contend “teaching for learning through learning for teaching is both a process and an outcome for multiple stakeholders participating in the sequenced episodes of peer observation of teaching”. Through the

presentation of these cases of context from the University wide PRO-Teaching mechanism this book has affirmed best practices in teaching and learning; and has identified areas that require improvement in establishing local, national and international benchmarks of teaching quality.

REFERENCES

- AACSB. (2012). AACSB International - The Association for Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, from <http://www.aacsb.edu/>
- AAHEA. (2012). AAHEA Official Homepage.
- ABET. (2012). ABET, from <http://www.abet.org/>
- Alderman, G. (2010). Reflections: Change, Quality and Standards in British Higher Education. *Journal of Change Management*, 10(3), 243-252. doi: 10.1080/14697017.2010.493288
- Anderson, W. A., Banerjee, U., Drennan, C. L., Elgin, S. C. R., Epstein, I. R., Handelsman, J., . . . Warner, I. M. (2011). Changing the Culture of Science Education at Research Universities. *Science*, 331(6014), 152-153. doi: 10.1126/science.1198280
- Argyris, C. (2008). *Teaching smart people how to learn*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business Press.
- Askew, S. (2004). Learning about teaching through reflective, collaborative enquiry and observation. *Learning Matters* 15, 2-4.
- Bamber, V., & Anderson, S. (2011). Evaluating learning and teaching: institutional needs and individual practices. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 17(1), 5-18. doi: 10.1080/1360144x.2011.586459
- Barnard, A., Croft, W., Irons, R., Cuffe, N., Bandara, W., & Rowntree, P. (2011). Peer partnership to enhance scholarship of teaching: a case study. [doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.518953]. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(4), 435-448. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.518953
- BCEQA. (2012). Registry of EQA Institutions | BC - Education Quality Assurance, from <http://www.bceqa.ca/designated-schools/eqa-registry/name/Royal%20Roads%20University/filter/all/limit/25>
- Becket, N., & Brookes, M. (2006). Evaluating quality management in university departments. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 14(2), 123-142. doi: 10.1108/09684880610662015
- Bennett, S., & Santy, J. (2009). A window on our teaching practice: Enhancing individual online teaching quality through online peer observation and support. A UK case study. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 9(6), 403-406. doi: 10.1016/j.nepr.2009.01.019
- Berk, R. A. (2005). Survey of 12 Strategies to Measure Teaching Effectiveness. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 17(1), 48-62.
- Biggs, J. (2001). The reflective institution: Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 41(3), 221-238. doi: 10.1023/a:1004181331049
- Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom*. ASHEERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Boud, D. (1999). Avoiding the traps: seeking good practice in the use of self assessment and reflection in professional courses. [doi: 10.1080/02615479911220131]. *Social Work Education*, 18(2), 121-132. doi: 10.1080/02615479911220131
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Menlo Park, California: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Chalmers, D. (2010). Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the Scholarship of Teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(1), 25-38. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2011.536970
- Chamberlain, J. M., D'Artrey, M., & Rowe, D.-A. (2011). Peer observation of teaching: A decoupled process. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(3), 189-201. doi: 10.1177/1469787411415083
- Dart, J. & Davies, R. (2003). A Dialogical, Story-Based Evaluation Tool: The Most Significant Change Technique. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 24(2): 137-155. DOI: 10.1177/109821400302400202
- Dolan, J. (1993). *Geographies of Learning: Theatre Studies, Performance, and the Performative*. *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 45, No. 4 *Disciplinary Disruptions*, December (pp. 417-441). Accessed from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3209014> on 04-05-14.

- Drew, S. & Klopper, C. (2013) Evaluating faculty pedagogic practices to inform strategic academic professional development: a case of cases. *Higher Education*. Drew, S. & Klopper, C. (2013) PRO-Teaching- Sharing ideas to develop capabilities. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 78, pp.1717-1725.
- Drew, S. & Klopper, C. (in press 2014) University Learning Spaces and Pedagogic Practices: Conceptions and perceptions. In Nygaard, C., Branch, J., Bartholomew, P. & Scott-Webber, L. (eds.) *Learning space design in Higher Education*, Faringdon: Libri Publishing.
- Ginns, P., Kitay, J., & Prosser, M. (2008). Developing conceptions of teaching and the scholarship of teaching through a Graduate Certificate in Higher Education. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 13(3), 175-185. doi: 10.1080/13601440802242382
- Ginns, P., Kitay, J., & Prosser, M. (2010). Transfer of academic staff learning in a research-intensive university. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 15(3), 235-246. doi: 10.1080/13562511003740783
- Glassick, C. (2000b). Reconsidering scholarship. *Journal of Public Health Management Practice*, 6(1), 4-9.
- Government, A. (2012). MyUniversity, from <http://myuniversity.gov.au/>
- Guide, T. G. U. (2012). Welcome to The Good Universities Guide | The Good Universities Guide, from http://www.gooduniguide.com.au/?gclid=CL_-mpXZ768CFVGApAodv3TJXg
- Hall, G., & Hooper, K. (2008). Australia's Exports of Education Services, 2012, from <http://www.rba.gov.au/publications/bulletin/2008/jun/2.html>
- Healey, M. (2000). Developing the Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education: A discipline-based approach. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 169-189. doi: 10.1080/072943600445637
- Hill, Y., Lomas, L., & MacGregor, J. (2003). Students' perceptions of quality in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 11(1), 15-20.
- Hutchings, P., & Shulman, L. S. (1999). The scholarship of teaching: New elaborations, new developments. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 31(5), 10-15.
- Klopper, C. & Drew, S. (2013) Teaching for learning, learning for teaching: Triangulating perspectives of teaching quality through peer observation and student evaluation. In Nygaard, C., Courtney, N. & Harvey, L. (Eds.) *Quality enhancement of university teaching and learning: theories and cases*. Libri Publishing Ltd. Chapter 8, pp.123-144.
- Jones, G. A., & Oleksiyenko, A. (2011). The internationalization of Canadian university research: a global higher education matrix analysis of multi-level governance. *Higher Education*, 61(1), 41-57. doi: 10.1007/s10734-010-9324-8
- Kemmis, S. (2006). Participatory action research and the public sphere. *Educational Action Research*, 14(4), 459-476.
- Langbein, L. (2008). Management by results: Student evaluation of faculty teaching and the mis-measurement of performance. *Economics of Education Review*, 27(4), 417-428. doi: 10.1016/j.econedurev.2006.12.003
- Lomas, L. (2004). Embedding quality: the challenges for higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 12(4), 157-165.
- Lomas, L., & Nicholls, G. (2005). Enhancing Teaching Quality Through Peer Review of Teaching. *Quality in higher education*, 11(2), 137-149. doi: 10.1080/13538320500175118
- Longden, B. (2010). Rowena Murray (ed): *The scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education*. *Higher Education*, 59(6), 799-800. doi: 10.1007/s10734-009-9267-0
- Marginson, S., Kaur, S., & Sawir, E. (2011). Global Position and Position-taking in Higher Education: The Case of Australia Higher Education in the Asia-Pacific. In S. Marginson, S. Kaur & E. Sawir (Eds.), (Vol. 36, pp. 375-392): Springer Netherlands.
- Marshall, S. J., Orrell, J., Cameron, A., Bosanquet, A., & Thomas, S. (2011). Leading and managing learning and teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(2), 87-103. doi: 10.1080/07294360.2010.512631
- Morley, L. (2012). Gender and Access in Commonwealth Higher Education. In W. R. Allen, R. T. Teranishi & M. Bonous-Hammarth (Eds.), *As the World Turns: Implications of Global Shifts in Higher Education for Theory, Research and Practice (Advances in Education in Diverse Communities: Research, Policy and Praxis, Volume 7) (Vol. 7, pp. 41-69)*: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE

- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students : a third decade of research* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- QAA. (2012). The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), from <http://www.qaa.ac.uk/Pages/default.aspx>
- Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2011). Social equity and the assemblage of values in Australian higher education. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 41(1), 5-22. doi: 10.1080/0305764x.2010.549459
- Rubin, L., & Herbert, C. (1998). Model for Active Learning: Collaborative Peer Teaching. *College Teaching*, 46(1), 26-.
- Sachs, J., Mansfield, N., & Kosman, B. (2011). Implementing a Teaching Standards Framework. *Proceedings of the Australian Quality Forum 2011*, 170-173.
- Schechner, R. in Stucky, N., Vimmer, C. (Eds) (2002). *Teaching Performance Studies*. Illinois; Southern Illinois University Press.
- Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner : how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schon, D. A., and DeSanctis, V. (1986). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, 34(3), 29-30.
- Shah, M., & Nair, C. S. (2011). Renewing quality assurance at a time of turbulence. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 15(3), 92-96. doi: 10.1080/13603108.2011.580793
- Skelton, A. (2004). Understanding 'teaching excellence' in higher education: a critical evaluation of the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 451-468. doi: 10.1080/0307507042000236362
- Smith, C. (2008). Building effectiveness in teaching through targeted evaluation and response: connecting evaluation to teaching improvement in higher education. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(5), 517-533. doi: 10.1080/02602930701698942
- Swinglehurst, D., Russell, J., & Greenhalgh, T. (2008). Peer observation of teaching in the online environment: an action research approach. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 24(5), 383-393. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2729.2007.00274.x
- TEQSA. (2012). *Higher Education Standards Framework | Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency*. Australia.
- Trigwell, K., Martin, E., Benjamin, J., & Prosser, M. (2000). Scholarship of teaching: A model. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 155-168.
- Trowler, P., & Bamber, R. (2005). Compulsory Higher Education Teacher Training: Joined-up policies, institutional architectures and enhancement cultures. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(2), 79-93. doi: 10.1080/13601440500281708
- Wang, Y.-h., & Lo, H.-C. (2012). Teaching quality enhancement using value-chain instruction system design. *Quality & Quantity*, 1-16. doi: 10.1007/s11135-012-9720-5
- Wong, V. Y.-Y. (2012). An alternative view of quality assurance and enhancement. *Management in Education*, 26(1), 38-42. doi: 10.1177/0892020611424608
- Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1992). *Professional development in higher education: A theoretical framework for action research*. London: Kogan Page.

Christopher Klopper
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University

Steve Drew
Griffith Sciences
Griffith University