

Lefoe, G. & Albury, R. (2006). Environments for change in a Faculty of Arts: The impact of teaching off campus *AACE Journal*, 14(3), 269-285.

Environments for Change in a Faculty of Arts: The Impact of Teaching Off Campus

GERALDINE LEFOE AND REBECCA ALBURY

University of Wollongong

NSW Australia

glefoe@uow.edu.au

ralbury@uow.edu.au

For a university in regional Australia, a new degree program offered through a remote campus and access centres, provided a supportive environment for faculty to try out new teaching and learning methods, specifically making use of a learning management system (WebCT) for aspects of communication and content. This article examines the impact this had on the faculty, in particular at the increased usage of ICT in subjects offered on campus and also examines issues such as workload and curriculum redesign, which were identified as problematic by faculty as they embraced innovative methods of teaching and learning.

The challenges of changing teaching practice using technology in a higher education setting can be an isolating activity, sometimes implemented behind closed doors and involving little discussion with peers. Though reported at conferences and in journals, often staff members in the next office or in the same program may be unaware of new initiatives undertaken by their colleagues. Recent initiatives within staff development have seen a move towards faculty based staff development activities which provide an avenue for sharing practice and encouraging “corridor” conversations about teaching and learning. One such initiative at a regional university in Australia was driven by the expansion of the university to include a remote campus and access centres. The Faculty of Arts was required to engage in the delivery of an undergraduate degree to the centres at varying distances from

the main campus. The consequence of this development was a community of practice, which involved faculty based academics and support unit academics working collaboratively with staff from other units including the library and information services. It also provided an avenue for staff development driven by faculty identified needs to design and implement a new degree which required the integration and use of technology to support its implementation.

The degree is now in its sixth year of implementation, with its first graduates at the end of 2002, and a few continuing to undertake an honours year. The Bachelor of Arts (Community and Environment) has transcended the status quo of teaching and learning on the main campus in a number of areas:

- it is a new degree program and is only available off campus;
- it is interdisciplinary;
- it uses innovative teaching and learning practices;
- it takes advantage of the availability of new technologies for teaching and learning, including web-based learning and videoconferencing; and
- the subjects have often been collaboratively developed with other staff from inside and outside the faculty including the library, learning development, and educational development (Albury, Lefoe, Littler, & Trivett, 2001; Curtis, Lefoe, Merten, Milne, & Albury, 1999).

The literature abounds with tales of innovation in teaching and learning in higher education (Hannan & Silver, 2000), and with the many success stories of individual faculty or “lone rangers” achievements using technology to support and improve learning (Alexander & McKenzie, 1998; Taylor, 1998). However there have been concerns for some time of the impact of such innovations on mainstream academics. One research study on the attitudes, skills, and behaviour of faculty use of instructional technology ($n=557$) in a large research university in Canada, identified that many faculty feel alienated by such developments (Anderson, Varnhagen, & Campbell, 1998). Their findings indicated such staff felt excluded from the dialogue about technology issues, were fearful of the impact of technology on their relationships with students, and felt an increasing conflict between demands on faculty time and resources. This notion is supported by Oliver

and Dempster (2003) in their discussion of the concept of “embedding e-learning” in higher education institutions and the implications this has for staff developers. They defined embedding as the need for “once novel practices becoming commonplace” but acknowledged that the definition is contested and the term has many variations in meaning (Oliver & Dempster, p. 143). They pointed out that staff required more than information dissemination since the change goes beyond embracing innovations of others in order to adapt their own teaching practice to suit the learning context. Indeed they suggested that changing the practice of individuals alone is not sufficient to change practice, but that it requires a change to the culture at the departmental level and the institutional level.

Some higher education institutions acknowledge that for these innovations to be mainstreamed there needs to be a more collaborative approach to change, and that where a group of innovative individuals work together for a common goal, this is more likely to achieve the continuation of the innovation after the initial implementation (Collis & De Boer, 1999; Sorg et al., 1999; Taylor, 1999). At the regional university, as the rhetoric changes from innovation to mainstreaming, a number of questions surface about the future of this innovative degree. Most certainly a key one from a faculty and a staff development perspective is concerned with the impact the degree program had on teaching and learning in the Faculty of Arts since its implementation in 2000.

During an initial interview the (then) Dean of Arts identified one of the key purposes of the innovation

For me personally I was convinced about it [the innovation] because I saw it as a good way into changing and rethinking the ways in which humanities and social sciences could be taught. So not simply a matter of delivery but really an opportunity to rethink what it means to teach and in some ways it's providing a, I can't say teaching qualification, but a teaching experience for people. The opportunity to think differently about their teaching. (Lefoe, 2003, p. 105)

The academic staff engaged in the early planning workshops to develop the new degree also indicated the importance of this impact on campus when they anticipated future outcomes through the completion of a Goal Attainment Scale (Curtis, 1998). They stated that if achieving better than expected then:

Curriculum delivery in (the new campus) has revolutionised on campus offering. Arts is in high demand and staff numbers are expanded. Production of subjects has facilitated efficient technological cross fertilisation in both curriculum design and student learning capabilities. The (new) Arts degree is better than an on campus degree and hosts top honours students. (University of Wollongong, March, 1998, Working Party minutes, attachment.)

At management and grass roots level there was a recognition that this program would provide an opportunity to try out new ideas about teaching and learning, and in particular to use information and communication technology (ICT) in a supportive environment. This article examines how well predictions for the future match realities six years into the new degree program. The timeline provides opportunity to see obstacles that were not apparent before. It also provides opportunity to reflect on what has happened and perceptions of the current status on campus in the Faculty of Arts. There are too many variables to attribute all changes to teaching and learning in the faculty to this innovation, but the main players have certainly been people willing to take a lead role in the faculty especially in incorporating the use of technology in their subjects, in supporting their colleagues and in sharing their knowledge of teaching and learning with other academics both within the institution and without.

This article provides a reflection on the impact on teaching and learning on campus of insights developed by the current practice of off campus teaching in the Faculty of Arts. The authors acknowledge that not all of the change to teaching practice can be attributed to the off campus developments. Nevertheless, we believe that the rapid take-up of new teaching and learning methods, in particular the use of ICT in the on campus environment, has been driven by the necessity to use these methods with these students at remote centres. The need to learn how to teach in remote centres provided a group of academic staff with a supportive environment to trial new teaching methods. Development of a new degree that incorporated ICT provided a focus for curriculum change in the Faculty of Arts.

CONTEXT: THE INNOVATION

Many Australian universities in a context of diminishing government funding have been able to attract growth funds through expansion of their

offerings to rural and remote areas or areas with perceived disadvantage by providing satellite campuses and access centres to attract local students (Chalmers, 1999; DEET & Baldwin, 1992; Fuller, 1996; Taylor & Blaik, 2001). For the regional university, the provision of growth funds to expand offerings through a new campus and access centres provided an environment for academic staff to rethink their teaching. Many of the subject developers tested new methods of teaching and learning, in particular using WebCT, a learning management system, with their on campus students prior to the opening of the centres in 2000 and continued as each year of the degree program was implemented. Some of the earlier findings have been reported elsewhere with a focus on cross-unit collaboration (Albury et al., 2001); and identifying recommendations for improvements to the program from the student perspective (Lefoe, Gunn, & Hedberg, 2002; Lefoe, 2003).

The faculty engaged in the development of this degree displayed a very strong commitment to their teaching through what can only be described as some challenging times. After several years of discussion, a committee from the Faculty of Arts finally agreed on the subjects for a new degree program, the Bachelor of Arts (Community and Environment). The degree was designed to bring together those issues that affect the community and the environment, and the skills needed to understand, analyse, and interpret these issues. The degree was one of several offered to provide access to higher education for students through a combination of a variety of technologies such as web sites and videoconferencing, paper-based materials, and the provision of face-to-face tutorials with local tutors and students. There was to be a degree of flexibility in the delivery, though certainly anticipating low initial numbers meant that the subjects offered would always be very limited.

In this particular project, the innovators who were often junior academics did not necessarily practice the more traditional methods of teaching, which were the established methods of the disciplines. Many of the more senior members of the disciplines were reluctant to engage in or support the interdisciplinary discussions that were a key part of the development phase of the degree. Certainly the apparent danger in appearing to cross the tribal boundaries through interdisciplinary subject development in the Arts has been the subject of earlier discussion in the literature (Becher, 1989). In particular this may impact on new academic staff who may do so inadvertently, as well as crossing other tacit boundaries by making teaching their focus rather than research, and by using technology in their teaching in a

department where the culture may frown on such innovative practices. In a research study on innovation in higher education, Hannan and Silver (2000) identified the reasons innovative teachers will take on such a challenge:

It seems that innovators will take on extra work, learn new skills, court unpopularity with other staff and take risks with their own careers so long as they feel that by doing so they can improve the quality of their teaching, and/or, if they feel that circumstances are such that they have no choice but to depart from their old methods to cope with new demands. (p. 32)

The innovation in this context involved thinking about new ways to deliver subjects where the learning environment is distributed across place and time. It involved finding ways to use technology, not only to provide content to students through such things as e-readings, but also to support communication between lecturers, tutors, and students. It involved thinking about ways to modularise subjects so that relevant modules could be used for different cohorts and finally being flexible about teaching methods used, in particular recognising that videoconferencing might not be successful for conventional lecturing but was a great tool for occasional meetings with students and tutors for discussions. While the faculty did not have strong ownership of the project because the decision to proceed had been made at a higher level, ultimately the leadership provided at the faculty executive level meant the development team took ownership and supported each other through the development phase of the new degree, then through the implementation (Lefor, 2003).

IMPACT ON CAMPUS TEACHING

Six years into the innovation, there was evidence of the impact on teaching in the Faculty of Arts, through a number of areas. The impact falls into three categories. The first was the development of a community of practice, initially among those in the South Coast Project followed by an expansion of the group which later waned; second, in the rewards and recognition achieved by the individuals involved in the innovation and finally in the recognition of the increased workload for those engaged in teaching off campus.

Building a Community of Practice

The establishment of a community of practice was central to the ability of the relatively junior academics involved in the original project development group to rethink and transform their curriculum development and teaching practices to meet the challenge of the distributed learning environment (Albury et al., 2001; Curtis et al., 1999). The characteristics of a community of practice (Stuckey, Hedberg, & Lockyer, 2001; Wenger, 1998) were strongly in evidence among the group:

- a clear purpose driven by the members,
- employment of appropriate technologies and styles of communication,
- membership of a social network where their expertise, leadership, content, and contributions are valued, and
- providing ongoing discussion, sharing of, and collaboration on, commonly valued things.

The members displayed a willingness to expand the community as new staff members joined and other faculty members displayed an interest in becoming involved. A curriculum review of the program saw major changes in direction for 2005 as the degree was shaped to meet the needs of new student cohorts emerging in the coastal communities.

The commitment by the faculty to a degree program offered through a network of access centres required a commitment to the institutionalisation of innovations regardless of the academic staff involved in teaching and a change in the accepted assumptions about “ownership” of subjects.

During the development phase of the degree the regular meetings of the South Coast Project developers group created a safe place to explore those assumptions and to try new ideas. The most active members of that group began to explore the similarities and differences among the disciplinary approaches to knowledge represented in the group (e.g., History, English Literature, Sociology), to discuss and experiment with innovative teaching techniques using ICT as well as print materials and to support each other in most aspects of academic life. They began to trust and work with members of academic and student support units outside the faculty to improve their

teaching materials and student learning outcomes and to understand a broader view of academic work within the University. They examined closely the way new technologies could support this change. The camaraderie of the group work led some to identify themselves as “core developers.” The enthusiasm led several to discuss the issues within their teaching programs and with other like-minded academics. They also applied their knowledge of innovation to the delivery of on campus subjects in ways ranging from introducing electronic discussion elements to developing an online library assignment that is transferable between subjects. The combination of talk and demonstration of innovation drew others to rethink their own teaching.

The rethinking does not constitute a revolution in modes of teaching and learning but a more modest beginning at reworking the “web of rules” in which the Arts academics work (Taylor, 1999). New staff joining the faculty have been attracted to the energy and support for learning to use ICTs in education as well as the small financial support for curriculum development within the South Coast initiative. The activity viewed by long term academics in the faculty as a new and worrying development is regarded by the newcomers as an established part of academic work in Arts that offers an opportunity for career development on the cutting edge of current academic practice. In addition, the core subjects in the degree must be taught even when the original subject developer is on study leave. This has meant that academics outside the original South Coast group have been recruited to coordinate a subject for one session only. That role allows them to explore the technology without the commitment to subject development. Even this level of engagement with the distributed learning environment challenges some to rethink aspects of their teaching (Trowler, 1998), and has convinced at least one lecturer of the value of the project as a contribution to his teaching practice.

Academics from the original group of developers have become formal or informal teaching mentors for their colleagues, discussing teaching issues, assessment tasks, and ways to use an appropriate level of technological support in their subjects. Some of the “core developers” became known as experts in the use of WebCT and acted as consultants to colleagues who were uncertain about using the new technology. They have also provided connections with members of other units who can provide the necessary skill development and support. The uptake of the use of ICTs on the Wollongong campus has taken a different form than the South Coast teaching. Lecturers

have been drawn to ICTs for reasons that may at first seem peripheral to rethinking “what it means to teach.” One felt compelled to establish a support web site for his first year subject as a result of the demands by students who had studied a subject coordinated by one of the core developers during the previous semester. For others, having a subject website reduces the burden of heavier teaching loads by having the subject outline and some set readings available electronically.

Certainly the number of WebCT subject sites supporting teaching and learning in the Faculty of Arts increased from 18 sites in 2000, to 43 in 2001, 47 in 2002 , 51 in 2003 and 67 in 2004. Optional use of sites by students decreased initially but now has more usage, while there has been a steady increase in sites used for content and communication. As the university quality assurance processes improve, other data is becoming available as to how the sites are used in teaching from initial optional use in subjects to a variety of uses, as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1
Subjects with WebCT Use in Faculty of Arts, 2002–2004

Type of use	Number of subjects		
	2002	2003	2004
Participation online is optional for students	16	13	26
Students must use the web to interact with the educational content necessary for study	8	10	9
Students must use the web to communicate with staff and/or other students	4	4	1
Students must use the web to both interact with content and to communicate with staff and/or other students	19	24	31

At the same time, staff working on subject delivery for the access centres have continued to collaborate with members of units outside the faculty to improve teaching and learning. One staff member revised her subject in collaboration with a member of the Learning Development group to include more formal scaffolding of the generic skills developed within the subject. Two others have spent time as Fellows with The Centre for Educational

Development and Interactive Resources (CEDIR), working with the technical staff to develop learning objects that have applicability beyond their subjects—each with a third collaborator from another unit. The development of a shared vision, as identified by Senge (1992) and Fullan (1993), has underpinned the innovation, whereby a broad commitment has eventually developed in the wider group as people have identified aspects of the project which reflect their own beliefs. While engaging a wider ownership of the innovation beyond the initial development group has been challenging, Trowler (1998) pointed out that ownership and understanding are “developed and sustained by hands-on experience and by giving room for experimentation and adaption” (p. 154).

As the innovation became mainstreamed, the original community of practice waned so that by 2003 there were few postings on the project listserver and less South Coast related informal discussion among staff who were not working together on a subject. The need to sustain the community of practice was no longer strong as technology became a part of teaching and learning (Wenger, 1998) and the demands to maintain discipline-based research projects occupied the faculty members. However, the experience of the community of developers made the process of reviving the community to meet demands for curriculum review in a changing funding and quality environment relatively easy as meetings were held in a common meeting time. The leadership changed and a couple of key members of the core developer group left the University for other jobs and others took a period of study leave. The personnel changes highlighted the problems with the faculty assumption that subjects are owned by individuals because in a course with a limited number of subjects offered at a distance, replacement of subjects required a longer lead time or greater commitment to the project by those who had been outside it. Faculty members who had been involved in teaching through the remote sites, but peripheral to planning began to take a larger role in the program delivery, which contributed to greater ownership of the need to address the challenges of the changing learning environment.

Rewards and Recognition

Researchers point to the lack of reward and recognition within the formal structures of the institution as one of the biggest obstacles in the path of innovation in higher education (Hannan & Silver, 2000; Silver, 1998). In

spite of resistance from many colleagues early in the project, participants in the BA on the South Coast have not suffered the extremes of lack of recognition experienced or feared elsewhere. All Faculty of Arts academics involved in the original 1998–1999 group of subject developers, who applied, had their probationary contracts converted or achieved a promotion. In 2002, two subject coordinators won the Vice Chancellor's award for Outstanding Contribution to Teaching and Learning (OCTAL) for their innovative collaboration in Australian Studies. The Coordinator of one of the access centres and the Librarian at the new campus received General Staff Awards in 2002 for their contributions to the success of the programmes. A geographer previously won an OCTAL for his subject now offered as a part of the BA and an Australian Publishing award for the textbook for that subject. The three OCTAL winners were nominated by the University for National Teaching awards. In addition to the personal recognition for members of the group, four projects led by South Coast academics have received internal educational strategic development funding to extend innovations to wider groups within the faculty or the University. Six students enrolled in the new degree were on the Dean's Merit List for the top 5% of students in 2001. One of these students won an award for the highest average mark over three years of study across all students in the Faculty of Arts and later won the university medal following her honours year. Students from the remote sites continue to achieve faculty and university awards for outstanding achievements.

Members of the South Coast subject developers and coordinators group have been invited to make presentations to key teaching and learning events on campus including the Vice Chancellor's Symposium on Innovative Teaching and Learning, the University Education Committee and the compulsory Introduction to Tertiary Teaching course for new staff. They are invited to contribute their expertise to new groups of subject developers from other faculties and to international visitors in the field of technological innovation in teaching and learning. These forms of personal and public recognition have contributed to the confidence of many of the subject coordinators who feel competent to intervene in policy discussions about teaching and learning on the basis of their experience. They are able to see some of the opportunities as well as threats that are a part of the changing higher education sector.

Acknowledgement of Workloads

Workload allocations, which reflect the changed nature of the work (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1999; McInnis, 2000) and policy changes, which reflect the changed role of the subject coordinator in a distributed learning context (Collis & Moonen, 2001; Harrison & Brodeth, 1999; Shotsberger, 1997) are issues identified elsewhere. For the Faculty of Arts, the issue was raised consistently in a number of forums by those engaged in teaching off campus. Recognition for the increased workload was finally provided in 2004 when the hours allocated for off campus subject administration were doubled compared to an on campus subject though only a minimal increase was received for actual teaching of the subject reflecting the increased use of technology in on campus subjects.

One of the key challenges in any discussion of workloads is how to teach the students who enrol. The assumptions of the faculty about the location of teaching within disciplines and ownership of individual subjects mean that each member of the academic staff has a heavy load in terms of both number of students to mark and number of hours of face-to-face contact with undergraduate students, that is, the terms in which teaching workloads are calculated. The foreshadowed reduction in university financial support for distributed learning will add to the existing pressures of trying to teach large numbers and conduct productive research programmes. These issues will become more urgent in the face of the Australian government's resistance to augment funding to cover recently negotiated pay increases (Maiden & O'Keefe, 2005) and the coming research quality exercise. The first phase of the faculty wide curriculum review has not addressed these issues in ways that prefigure change in subject design, modes of assessment, and a vision of the degree as a whole. The current faculty leadership group has neither a shared experience of teaching in distributed learning environments nor a shared vision of nontraditional undergraduate programmes and teaching practices. The workload issues raised by those teaching in the South Coast and Southern Highlands distributed learning environment cannot be fully resolved in isolation from the faculty wide curriculum and teaching practices.

LESSONS LEARNED

The delivery of a degree program at a distance has identified many assumptions, processes and policies on campus that need to be changed to better

support teaching, especially innovative teaching. At the faculty level there are two levels of issues, first the immediate teaching and subject administrative demands of teaching in a distributed learning environment and thus better processes and policies to support those demands; second a longer term vision of the place of an innovative curriculum to meet the demands on the faculty over the next 10 years. At the university level, the need for reform is more complex including a variety of administrative issues, a funding model that maintains the support for high quality subject delivery, support for an ongoing cycle of review and improvement, and a developed policy of technical support that includes infrastructure and support personnel (Lefoe, 2003).

In spite of the recognition of the achievements of the group, until 2003 within the faculty the formal workloads agreements were based on the assumptions of conventional pattern of lectures and tutorials with face-to-face teaching. Those who taught differently were required to negotiate any differences in the workload by explaining their practice in terms of the conventional pattern. In the face of increasing student numbers and thus workloads on campus, members of the South Coast group made a submission to the faculty workloads committee. The new workload document acknowledged the increased administration to communicate with tutors and students at a distance but indicated that the use of technology in teaching should be accounted for as normal teaching activity. The projected changes in upper level subject delivery from a mixed mode of print and online material supplied by the subject coordinator in Wollongong with a local tutor for classroom exercises to all teaching originating in Wollongong will test the faculty resolve to address the different teaching demands of online and face-to-face teaching within a workload model.

While workload issues can and will continue to be addressed on a year by year basis, the problems of how to meet the combined pressures of maintaining high research output and meeting the learning needs of an increasingly diverse group of students (McInnes, 2000) need a different approach. To date in the Faculty of Arts, the South Coast and Southern Highlands subject coordinators are the only group of academics who meet regularly to discuss a common purpose beyond their disciplinary or research related concerns. The regular meetings have played a role in the spread of the use of educational technologies and the rethinking of some teaching methods at the subject level, however, most of the coordinators are too junior to have significant governance roles at the faculty level. It has been difficult to maintain and extend the vision of an interdisciplinary teaching team who

take a whole of degree approach to learning rather than the conventional discipline based model that regards other aspects of student learning as unrelated to the concerns of those providing teaching in the major (Ivanitskaya, Clark, Montgomery, & Primeau, 2002).

Another issue, which had to be addressed at the institution level, was the need for ongoing tutor training at the remote centres as there have been limited funds for this training since the first year and only a small number of new tutors to attend training. This did however highlight a need for tutor training and support on the Wollongong campus, where training for all tutors has been implemented across many faculties. In addition, south coast tutors travel to the Wollongong Campus each semester for tutor training and the opportunity to meet the subject coordinators face to face to facilitate communication during the semester.

Where new teaching and learning strategies are developed for off campus modes, the flexibility may suit on campus students as well. Many subjects offered on the South Coast are now taught in the same way on campus. This is not always well received by students, who may not have the same commitment or interest in student centred subjects, which require them to take responsibility for their own learning, especially where a subject may require limited face-to-face contact and be mostly online, as is the case for two of the subjects (Lefoe, 2003).

The South Coast implementation has identified many processes and policies on campus that needed to be changed to improve teaching administration. Planning issues, which were often solved on the spot in the local situation required specified policies and procedures when other centres were involved, for example, on campus it is possible to change a class location or time for a tutor to meet the needs of the student group but when there are four other centres involved and a videoconference will run from Wollongong, then timetabling changes become a significant organisational issue.

Policies and procedures are gradually being put into place on campus such as a (draft) statement of the subject coordinator's role and the tutor's role. There are also quality assurance processes in place for the initiation of web sites, faculty service agreements for subject level design and support. In addition there is a need for recognition of the requirements of students at a distance by other units who administer within the university, for example, research ethics approval, careers advice, learning development, and so forth. Some of this is happening, but frequently procedures are not yet in place.

CONCLUSION

Innovative teaching and learning practices in higher education institutions have frequently been the domain of “lone rangers” (Taylor, 1998). However for innovative practices to be embraced by larger numbers of faculty, then an environment that supports change is critical. For the Faculty of Arts at the University of Wollongong a new degree program offered to a remote campus and access centres provided an environment for faculty to trial new teaching and learning methods. As these academics found success in their new methods they used them in their on campus subjects as well, and provided support for other faculty members through a community of practice, sharing their new knowledge and skills. As the innovation became part of the mainstream academic activity the community declined but the integration of technology use in teaching has continued to increase.

While new curriculum development has not yet “revolutionalised on campus offering” as mentioned in the Goal Attainment Scale, the on campus offerings in Arts have certainly incorporated new teaching and learning methods at a faster rate than expected. The student numbers have expanded and the faculty has taken steps to acknowledge some aspects of the increased workload. However, Fullan (1993) reminded us that universities cannot mandate the development of skill and commitment, “The only alternative that works is creating conditions that enable and press people to consider personal and shared visions, and skill development through practice over time”(p. 23). This initiative has provided such conditions but whether the integration of technology in mainstream teaching in innovative ways is sustainable over time remains to be seen.

References

- Albury, R., Lefoe, G., Littler, C., & Trivett, N. (2001). *Creating partnerships in a distributed learning environment: Some lessons learned*. Paper presented at the 24th International Conference of Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia, Newcastle.
- Alexander, S., & McKenzie, J. (1998). *An evaluation of information technology projects for university learning*. Canberra, South Australia: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Anderson, T., Varnhagen, S., & Campbell, K. (1998). Faculty adoption of teaching and learning technologies: Contrasting early adopters and

- mainstream faculty. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXVI-II(2,3), 71-98.
- Becher, T. (1989). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines*. Milton Keynes, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Chalmers, D. (1999). A strategic university-wide initiative to introduce programs of study using flexible delivery methods. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 7(2-3), 249-268.
- Coaldrake, P., & Stedman, L. (1999). *Academic work in the twenty-first century. Changing roles and policies* (Occasional Paper Series Report No. 99H). Canberra, South Australia: DETYA. Retrieved July 26, 2006, from http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/archives/academic_work_in_the_twenty_first_century.htm
- Collis, B., & Moonen, J. (2001). *Flexible learning in a digital world: Experiences and expectations*. London: Kogan Page.
- Collis, B., & De Boer, W. (1999). Scaling up from the pioneers: The tele-TOP method at the University of Twente. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 7(2-3), 93-111.
- Curtis, S. (1998). *Project LEAD: Leading and evaluating advancements in delivery. Progress Report* (Unpublished). Wollongong, NSW: University of Wollongong.
- Curtis, S., Lefoe, G., Merten, M., Milne, C., & Albury, R. (1999). *Passing through the pain barrier: Making a flexibly delivered degree*. Paper presented at the Cornerstones of Higher Education: HERDSA Annual International Conference, Melbourne, Australia.
- DEET & Baldwin, P. J. (1992). *Higher education funding for the 1992-94 triennium*. Canberra, South Australia: AGPS
- Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Fuller, D. (1996). *Provision of higher education on the south coast of NSW - Options study*. Canberra, South Australia: DETYA
- Hannan, A., & Silver, H. (2000). *Innovating in higher education: Teaching, learning and institutional cultures*. Buckingham, UK: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Harrison, B.T., & Brodeth, E. (1999). Real work through real collegiality: Faculty seniors views on the drive to improve teaching and research. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 21(2), 203-214.
- Ivanitskaya, L., Clark, D., Montgomery, G., & Primeau, R. (2002). Interdisciplinary learning: Process and outcomes. *Innovative Higher Education*, 27(2), 95-111.
- Lefoe, G. (2003). *Characteristics of a supportive context for distributed learning: a case study of the implementation of a new degree*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Wollongong. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://www.library.uow.edu.au/adt-NWU/public/adt-NWU20050927.114828/>

- Lefoe, G., Gunn, C., & Hedberg, J. (2002). Recommendations for teaching in a distributed learning environment: The students' perspective. *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, 18(1), 40-56.
- Maiden, S., & O'Keefe, B. (2005, 20 April). VCs angry at funding stand-off. *The Australian, Higher Education*, (p. 35).
- McInnis, C. (2000). The work roles of academics in Australian universities (Evaluations and Investigations Programme Report No. 00/5). Canberra, ACT: AGPS. Retrieved July 25, 2006, from http://www.dest.gov.au/sectors/higher_education/publications_resources/profiles/archives/work_roles_of_academics_australian_universities.htm
- Oliver, M., & Dempster, J. A. (2003). Embedding e-learning practices. In R. Blackwell & P. Blackmore (Eds.), *Towards strategic staff development in higher education* (pp. 142-153). Berkshire, England: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Shotsberger, P.G. (Ed.). (1997). *Emerging roles for instructors and learners in the web-based instruction classroom*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.
- Senge, P.M. (1992). *The fifth discipline*. Sydney: Random House Australia.
- Silver, H. (1998). *Organisational culture and innovation in higher education*. Retrieved July 25, 2006, from <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/000000675.htm>
- Sorg, S., Truman-Davis, B., Dziuban, C., Moskal, P., Hartman, J., & Juge, F. (1999). Faculty development, learner support and evaluation in web-based programs. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 7(2-3), 137-153.
- Stuckey, B., Hedberg, J., & Lockyer, L. (2001). Professional development online-doing IT pedagogically. In D. W. J. Price, N. Davis, & J. Willis (Ed.), *Proceedings of SITE 2001 Society for Information Technology and Teacher Education* (pp. 2439-2444). Norfolk, VA: Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education.
- Taylor, P.G. (1998). Institutional change in uncertain times: Lone ranging is not enough. *Studies in Higher Education*, 23(3), 269-279.
- Taylor, P.G. (1999). *Making sense of academic life: Academics, universities, and change*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Taylor, P.G., & Blaik, J. (2001). *What have we learned? Symposium*. (Unpublished report). Brisbane, Australia: Logan Campus, Griffith University.
- Trowler, P. (1998). *Academics responding to change: New higher education frameworks and academic cultures*. Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.