RE-IMAGINING ACADEMIC STAFF DEVELOPMENT

spaces for disruption

Editor

Lynn Quinn

Theorising the pedagogy of a formal programme for university lecturers

Jo-Anne Vorster & Lynn Quinn

Introduction

In this chapter and the following one we discuss the theory underpinning the curriculum and the pedagogy of a postgraduate diploma in higher education (PG Dip (Higher Education)) offered to lecturers. The purpose is to critically examine the programme in order to make visible the structuring principles and to develop insights into the knowledge and practices that enable effective courses for university lecturers. Bernstein and Maton's model of the epistemic-pedagogic device is used to analyse our conceptualisation of the curriculum. We interrogate the value basis of the curriculum, as well as how decisions are made about the knowledge that is selected for the programme. In addition, we argue that the way the curriculum is sequenced, paced and assessed contributes to our aim of developing lecturers' knowledge of the theory and practice of teaching and learning, to enhance their practice as teachers of their disciplines. Thus in this chapter and the next one, we examine the logic of the curriculum to demonstrate how the epistemic-pedagogic device of the PG Dip (Higher Education) has been conceptualised.

Formal staff development programme

The purpose of the formal staff development programme conceptualised and offered by to academic staff from Rhodes University is to create spaces for academics to develop and enhance their abilities to design curricula and to facilitate and assess student learning in the South African higher education context. The programme contributes to the professional development of academics as teachers, by building their knowledge of higher education as a field of study and facilitating opportunities for them to relate this knowledge to their practice as lecturers and to their students'

learning. Thus the curriculum faces "both ways" – to the emerging field of higher education studies (HES) and to lecturers' work as teachers.

Central to what we do in the programme is to foreground and disrupt academics' everyday, common-sense notions of teaching and learning, in order to create spaces for them to develop theoretically sound understandings and practices in relation to teaching and learning in their disciplines.

Teaching, in our view, is not only the exercise of a set of skills and techniques, it is a scholarly activity. Like Boyer (1990), we believe that the hallmarks of excellent teaching are the same habits of mind that characterise other types of scholarly work. In our programme participants thus engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning, which entails their asking critical and difficult questions about all aspects of their practice, and engaging in inquiry and investigation, especially in matters related to student learning in their disciplines.

In the programme, we create the spaces for lecturers to explore the interplay between the ontological, epistemological and methodological foundations of their disciplines, and the scholarship of teaching, learning, curriculum, assessment and evaluation. Throughout the programme lecturers are required to integrate their developing knowledge and understanding of the scholarship of teaching and learning with their reflections on their teaching practices. This model of the critically reflexive practitioner enables lecturers to position themselves and their practice in relation to the theories presented in the programme. This process, we believe, contributes to making explicit the relationship between lecturers' identities as discipline experts and as teachers of their disciplines.

Theoretical concepts: the epistemic-pedagogic device

In order to ensure the coherence of a programme taught by a team of academic staff developers, it is important that a level of common understanding of both the purpose and the theoretical framework of the programme is developed amongst them.[1] This common understanding enables the teaching team to recontextualise aspects of their field knowledge into a curriculum.

Underpinned by a social realist approach, we accept that "… to understand education we need to understand knowledge" (Maton & Moore 2010:1), and that knowledge as the foundation of all educational practices is worthy of investigation. In this

---

1   At the same time, though, academic developers should also constantly examine and critique the frameworks which they use to theorise their practice. The intention is for the analysis presented in some of the chapters of this book to contribute to this.

chapter and the next we interrogate the knowledge and pedagogy underpinning the programme, using Bernstein's model of the pedagogic device and Maton's extension of that model as the epistemic-pedagogic device. Using these models we aim to make explicit the underlying principles that structure both our conceptualisation of the curriculum and our pedagogic practices. As Maton says:

> An adequate theoretical tradition is not only epistemologically more powerful but also socially more inclusive. By making visible the workings of the gaze, we have a chance to make that gaze more widely available. Not only can we then see further, more of us can do so (Maton forthcoming).

The purpose of this analysis is to contribute to academic staff developers' conceptions about the curricula and pedagogy of courses for academic staff. In addition, we hope it will lead to productive questions about the relationship between the work of academic developers and the field of higher education studies.

The pedagogic device

We used Bernstein's theory (1996, 2000) of the pedagogic device (PD) to understand the general principles which underpin the transformation of disciplinary or field knowledge into curriculum and pedagogic practices. Bernstein conceptualised the PD as consisting of three *fields*: the field of production, the field of recontextualisation and the field of reproduction. Each of these fields is regulated by a different set of relatively stable and interrelated 'rules' which he calls the distributive, recontextualising and evaluative rules. Although the rules are relatively stable, they are not ideologically free, and will vary according to different contexts.

In the field of *production,* decisions are made regarding how knowledge can be produced in a field or discipline – what kind of knowledge can be produced and by whom. The field of production is regulated by a set of distributive rules which can be defined as the ordered regulation and distribution of the 'worthwhile' knowledge in a field. Bernstein makes a distinction between what he calls mundane knowledge and esoteric knowledge. Mundane knowledge or everyday knowledge is embedded in specific contexts, whereas esoteric knowledge is context-independent. In the case of staff development, the mundane knowledge would be that related to the skills and craft knowledge which a teacher could draw on, whereas esoteric knowledge refers to theories, concepts and principles derived from research in the field.

In the *recontextualising field,* the knowledge from the field of production is transformed into specific curricula. Recontextualising has to do with both the 'what' and the 'how' of curricula, that is, with "the theory of instruction" (Bernstein 2000:34).

The *field of reproduction* refers to the actual pedagogic practice and is regulated by evaluative rules. This field has to do with the enacted curriculum and the way in which the students come to understand the criteria by which they will be evaluated/assessed – in other words the pedagogy, which is designed to enable programme participants to come to understand what constitutes legitimate knowledge of the field, as well as how this knowledge can be articulated. It is in the spaces between the three fields that ideology can come into play. This chapter is an attempt to make explicit our ideological position as academic staff developers.

The pedagogic device, consisting of the three related fields described above, can contribute to understanding the principles which inform what Bernstein refers to as the "pedagogising of knowledge" (2000:25). The remainder of the chapter focuses on theorising the ways in which the "recontextualising agents", that is, the curriculum designers, have selected from the knowledge of the field of higher education studies (HES) to construct a curriculum for the formal staff development programme. In addition, we shall clarify how our ideological positions relate to the nature of higher education, the roles of lecturers in this context, and the potential of pedagogic practice to play a role in relation to the challenges we face in a transforming South African society more broadly, and higher education specifically.

The process of recontextualisation is regulated by two sets of recontextualising rules which Bernstein terms the *regulative discourse* (RD) and the *instructional discourse* (ID). The regulative discourse refers to the moral ordering or the values that the curriculum and pedagogy are based on. The instructional discourse refers to the selection, sequencing, pacing and assessment (evaluation) of pedagogic practice. By its very nature, education generally is a strongly axiological project (and programmes for academic staff development are no exception); all curricula have a value orientation, whether this is explicitly articulated or implicit. Bernstein argues that the regulative discourse is always dominant and that the instructional discourse (choices about curriculum and pedagogy) is always embedded within the regulative framework.

In the next section we discuss the nature of the pedagogic device of the programme in order to explicate the principles which inform our curriculum design and pedagogic decision-making.

The pedagogic discourse of the programme

The focus of the programme is on facilitating the development of academics' identities as teachers. This is done through facilitating the building of a strong knowledge base of the field of teaching and learning in order to enable them to design curricula and teach in ways that make the discourses and associated

practices of their disciplines explicit to students. Thus we continue to ensure that the programme is underpinned by a strong knowledge base while not losing sight of the kinds of teachers it endeavours to develop. The need for a strong knowledge base for academic staff development is explored further later in this chapter and also in Chapter 5.

The regulative discourse underpinning the programme

The regulative discourse, that is, the values that inform the curriculum, stems from emerging understandings of the role and purpose of the university internationally, and particularly in the context of a transforming South Africa. While internationally the massification of higher education has created the need for curriculum and pedagogic reforms, in the South African context, the need for creating structures and processes to enable epistemological access (Morrow 1993) is much greater than in most developed countries. This can be ascribed to an education system which still fails the majority of particularly black students (Scott, Yeld & Hendry 2007).

The focus of the staff development programme is not only on how lecturers can contribute to the development of students' cognitive abilities. There is also a focus on the axiological nature of education. Education plays a role in shaping the personal, social and moral development of individuals, and preparing students to participate in society as responsible and productive citizens. As a social project, education therefore has always been a highly morally charged endeavour whose teleological purpose has been strongly moral, political and affective (Maton forthcoming).

In South Africa, academic development (AD) first began to emerge as a field during the last years of the apartheid era in order to serve a transformative role in higher education (Volbrecht & Boughey 2004). In many institutions, this social justice/transformative role has remained fundamental to the work of academic developers. The regulative discourse of the programme is strongly informed by the transformation agenda of the field of academic development in the South African context, and is informed by four key axiological principles. However, we argue that these principles should be the *sine quo non* of all courses for academic staff.

Firstly, the purpose of the programme is to contribute to participating lecturers developing theoretically informed understandings, knowledge and practices to design curricula and teach in ways which will support *epistemological access* for a diverse student body. Higher education in South Africa continues to be dogged by poor participation rates, high attrition rates and appalling failure rates. In particular, despite espoused attempts by the sector, including those of academic developers to redress the inequities of the past, it is the black students who are suffering the most. The cohort study conducted by Scott *et al* shows that barely 5% of the black 20-24

age group succeed in higher education and graduate with a recognised qualification (2007). As Scott points out:

> Genuinely accommodating the diverse intake that is needed for development means ensuring that the education process, in terms of design and teaching practices, is aligned with the students' legitimate learning needs, so that they have a reasonable chance of succeeding. Access without success is a hollow achievement, does little or nothing to meet South Africa's social and economic needs, and it may erode public support for the higher education sector (2009:10).

We would thus argue that lecturers have a strong moral responsibility for ensuring that they do everything in their power to ensure not just formal access to higher education, but also epistemological access and success for all their students. For the reasons outlined above, assisting lecturers to do this is *the* key axiological principle informing the programme.

The second axiological principle for the programme, one which we suggest is often neglected or underplayed in staff development courses, is related to respecting participants' disciplinary backgrounds and identities (see also Leibowitz *et al* 2011; Manathunga 2007). *Disciplinary differences*, that is, ontological, epistemological, methodological, and axiological differences between disciplines and fields, are recognised and respected. These differences result in discipline-specific curricula and pedagogy. Participating lecturers do tasks in which they explore how (or whether) theories and practices discussed in the programme relate to their own disciplinary and departmental contexts.

Research has shown that academics' identities are primarily formed by their disciplines (see for example Becher & Trowler 2001). The understanding that for most academics their pedagogic identities are intimately bound to their disciplinary identities has had a strong influence on the regulative discourse of the PG Dip (Higher Education). Mills and Huber maintain that academics' "disciplinary calling, identity, or vocation remains key to [their] pedagogical imaginations". Furthermore they warn that "(b)oth can be endangered or lost when faced with imposed formalisations from other authorities or fields" (2005:22). Heeding this warning, we have been careful to acknowledge and respect the disciplinary differences and expertise of programme participants. This is a strong axiological foundation for our work as academic staff developers. In the programme participants interrogate the nature of their disciplines and then relate these understandings to the knowledge and ideas presented in the programme. The programme is not offered on a 'one-size fits all' basis.

Common to many courses aimed at professional development, the third axiological foundation for the programme is the notion of the critically reflexive practitioner[2]. Linked to both values mentioned above, in the PG Dip (Higher Education) this notion entails encouraging participants to critically interrogate their dual roles of knowledge producer and teacher – to reflect on and make explicit to themselves the nature of their disciplines and what this means for designing courses and teaching in ways which will enable epistemological access for all students. A key feature of our programme, underpinned by the notion of reflective practice, is that it requires critical engagement, based on evidence and theory (Clegg 2005), with the roles and practices of higher education teaching, rather than having as its goal the teaching of a set of generic skills and techniques. It goes beyond concern for the individual practitioner to include wider issues raised by the discipline and by society. It has as its intention the development of teachers who are reflexive, critical professionals. In the words of Light and Cox:

> The model of practice proposed here is that of mutual [students' and teachers'] empowerment through an engagement with the language(s) of teaching and learning, through critical understanding of its principles … It is not asking academics to submit to a barrage of techniques, tips and prescribed practices … but rather, to engage in a way of thinking about their own practices (2000:14).

The fourth principle is that it is often necessary to disrupt participants' common-sense understandings about teaching and learning, such as the belief that all that is required to solve the challenges in higher education is teachers who possess good teaching skills and appropriate craft knowledge (Scott 2009). Inherent in this skills discourse is the dismissal of the intellectual complexity of teaching and the adoption of an 'anti-intellectual' or 'atheoretical' perspective on teaching (Rowland 2001:163). We understand teaching as being about much more than a set of craft skills. The programme is thus underpinned by an understanding of academic staff development as critical engagement with the theory and practice of higher education. This approach is congruent with Lueddeke's argument that "significant pedagogical concerns that face academics will not be resolved until a more scholarly approach is taken in the development of teaching staff" (2003:215). Thus a crucial consideration in the design of the programme is that we draw on the knowledge from the emerging field of HES to inform our framing of participants' engagement with teaching and learning to enable them to interrogate their practice. We ask participants to make explicit their philosophies of teaching and learning – their beliefs about how learning happens. Through the introduction of theory and research from the field of HES, they are led to question their everyday assumptions – to identify mismatches between

---

2   See Belluigi Chapter 8 in this text for in-depth discussion on reflection and reflexivity in the context of a formal staff development course.

their espoused theory of teaching and learning and their enacted theory. Therefore particular attention is paid to the selection of curriculum content that will build academics' knowledge of the field of education and HES specifically. The selection of content will be further discussed in the following chapter.

In the light of the analysis of the regulative discourse of the programme offered above, we would argue that the ultimate aim of any staff development should be to equip lecturers better, to ensure "access to the knowledge that universities distribute" (Morrow 2007:18) and success for all their students. To do this requires that academic staff developers respect and engage with the disciplinary differences and identities which have an impact on lecturers' pedagogic identities. However, irrespective of these differences, to be an effective lecturer, able to respond to the complexities of teaching diverse groups of students in the constantly changing contextual demands of higher education, requires the ability to critically reflect on all aspects of their practice. Finally, in order to do all of the above, programme participants need to draw on research and theory from the field of HES. In choosing what we introduce our participants to in the programme, we are influenced by what we consider to be 'powerful knowledge'. Our understanding of what 'powerful knowledge' is, is informed by the regulative discourse which underpins the programme. We elaborate on this in Chapter 5.

Having analysed the value orientations of the programme, in the next section we discuss how these have been translated into the pedagogical choices made in conceptualising the instructional discourse of the programme.

Instructional discourse of the programme

Selection of curriculum content

The staff development programme is a professional qualification, so its focus is on the everyday practice of academics and on the development of theoretical knowledge of teaching and learning, curriculum development, the assessment of student learning, the evaluation of teaching and courses[3], as well as other pertinent aspects related to the higher education context. As previously explained, our primary purpose is to introduce participants to knowledge of the field of higher education, in order to enable them to design courses and pedagogical processes that will provide epistemological access for a diverse student body. The conceptual and theoretical approaches that the field of HES draws on include those from psychology,

---

3   The PG Dip (Higher Education) consists of four core modules, namely, Learning and Teaching, Curriculum Development, Assessment of Student Learning, Evaluation of Teaching and Courses, and one research elective.

sociology, linguistics (literacy studies) and philosophy. The programme developers' knowledge of student induction into disciplines is built through drawing on these disciplines as well as research from the field of HES. As HES is such a diffuse field, selection of curriculum content can seem arbitrary. However, the curriculum for the programme gains its coherence from its focus on epistemological access. The notion of *epistemological access* is therefore the central organising concept for the selection of curriculum content, and for ensuring theoretical and practical coherence of the curriculum. Therefore much of the theoretical material selected contributes to building an understanding of teaching as "enabling students' participation in academic discourse" (Northedge 2003a:17). Because we understand learning and literacy to be connected, and we understand academic disciplines as each having their own ways of knowing, the concept of *academic literacy* is pivotal. The term 'academic literacy' is used to describe the set of cultural understandings or the "rules and conventions" (Ballard & Clanchy 1988) shared by disciplinary experts, and into which students, if they wish to succeed in academia, need to be inducted. These understandings refer not only to textual conventions; they also define what counts as knowledge, and how knowledge is constructed within specific disciplines.

Since HES is a new field into which academics as disciplinary experts are being inducted, programme developers are cognisant of introducing participants to the conceptual language of the field in a way that is accessible. Similar to the findings of Kandlbinder and Peseta (2011) in their research on the content and key concepts used in professional development courses, we too rely on the work of theorists such as Ramsden, Biggs, Entwistle, Prosser, Trigwell, Barnett and Marton (amongst others) and on key concepts such as reflective practice, assessment-driven learning, approaches to learning, constructive alignment, and scholarship of teaching and learning (amongst many others) (Peseta 2011:84). As part of the process of recontextualising (Bernstein 2000) this knowledge from the field, we would argue that the works of these scholars and the key concepts listed above are useful if they are used in specific ways. For example, as many of the ideas make intuitive sense, they can be usefully employed as 'hooks' to challenge participants to shift from more common-sense or unexamined understandings of student learning and teaching to engage with more complex and robust concepts and theories. We also contend that these key concepts are most useful under three conditions: one, if they are used as part of a course with strong organising principles (such as those mentioned above); two, if they are augmented with the work of more recent scholars who propose theories and concepts which are appropriate to the current higher education context and changing student profile (for example, Northedge 2003a & b; Boughey 2002; Luckett & Luckett 2009); and three, if critiques of the concepts are both offered and encouraged in the course (for example, Haggis's (2003) approaches to learning

critique; Marshall & Case's (2005) counter arguments to Haggis; and Mann's (2001) alternative perspective on the student experience).

What the programme endeavours to do is to contribute to participants' abilities to conceptualise their pedagogic practices in principled ways, and to develop 'systematic knowledge' of teaching and learning as opposed to 'craft' knowledge (Scott 2009; Shay 2012) of the field, which, as mentioned earlier, has traditionally been the focus of many staff development courses.

The programme content is continuously related to the higher education context at a range of levels (internationally, nationally, institutionally, disciplinary and the classroom). Therefore, like all curricula in professional fields, the curriculum 'faces both ways' (M. Barnett 2006), to integrate theory and practice in a way that enables participants to 'see' and interrogate the principles behind what they do in practice. This process is facilitated by the careful sequencing and pacing of theory and practice in the programme.

Sequencing and pacing: juxtaposing theory and practice

Participating lecturers come from a variety of disciplines including the humanities, social sciences, commerce and the natural sciences. Bernstein argues that disciplines in the humanities and social sciences (human sciences) are structured differently to those in the natural sciences. This means that knowledge in these fields is produced in different ways. The human sciences have what Bernstein (2000) calls a horizontal knowledge structure, while the natural sciences evince a hierarchical knowledge structure. Knowledge in the human sciences, according to Bernstein, is built segmentally, by adding a new theory to explain a phenomenon. Each of the human sciences also has a different way of generating knowledge, speaking and writing. The natural sciences, on the other hand, build knowledge cumulatively. The aim is to develop ever more general theories towards the apex of an imaginary field triangle which is able to explain ever more phenomena at the base of the triangle. Thus, learning and teaching the languages of the various disciplines are distinctive processes, and developing knowledge cumulatively, as in the natural sciences, makes different demands on students from learning a range of segmental languages, as in the human sciences.

HES has a horizontal knowledge structure which draws from a range of fields which also have horizontal knowledge structures. This can mean that participants from disciplines with hierarchical knowledge structures such as physics, for example, could be frustrated when knowledge and concepts in the PG Dip (Higher Education) are not introduced in an incremental fashion. We return to discussion of this later.

Muller (2008) makes a distinction between *conceptual* and *contextual curriculum coherence*. In the curriculum of the programme, contextual coherence is emphasised more than conceptual coherence. In the programme the order in which concepts, theories and topics are presented is not as important[4] as their relevance and coherence in a particular context. For this reason, each module starts with participants' exploration of their own practice. They are required to investigate the ontological, epistemological, axiological and methodological foundations of their disciplines. They interrogate the relationship between the nature of their discipline, the way knowledge is produced in the discipline, and how learning and teaching happen in their context. This is because 'good' teaching which enables successful learning is context-specific. It therefore makes little sense to offer generic procedures for dealing with specific teaching and learning challenges. In the process of examining their disciplines, lecturers inevitably explore their own individual identities in relation to both their disciplines and their orientations to teaching and learning.

Along with this focus on the context, we suggest that conceptual development and thus conceptual coherence in the curriculum remains an important consideration. Wheelahan argues that "theoretical knowledge must be at the centre of all educational qualifications, including vocational qualifications" (2010:145). Participants need to be able to understand, for example, how learning happens, and why students may experience learning difficulties, so that they are able to examine a teaching or learning problem using relevant theory and develop their own context-specific approaches to teaching and learning dilemmas.

In the programme an important pedagogical principle is to negotiate the constant interplay between educational *theory* and participants' pedagogical *practice*. This is so for two reasons. Firstly, it enables them to explain why things are the way they are in their teaching contexts, and secondly, it brings educational theories to bear on solving pedagogic problems and challenges. In addition, it is our aim to facilitate what Maton (2011) terms *cumulative learning*, that is, the ability to apply knowledge in novel contexts across time. Maton explains that educational fields run the risk of restricting students' ability to draw principles from what they learn, and to apply these to a range of different and novel contexts. This is because in the field of education, there is a greater focus on the dispositions of learners, at the expense of an emphasis on the building of field knowledge and principles (Maton forthcoming). What is needed to achieve the desired cumulative learning in a programme such as the PG Dip (Higher Education) is for participants to develop the ability to 'move' from context to concept/theory and back again as they demonstrate that they are

---

4   Although later in the chapter we argue that there are *pedagogical* reasons for the order in which we offer the core modules.

able to recontextualise (in a range of contexts) what they learn about HE pedagogy, particularly in relation to teaching and learning in their disciplines. This aspect of participants' learning will be discussed further in Chapter 5.

We noted above that our endeavour is to support participants' development of knowledge of the field of HES, because of the potential of this knowledge to facilitate an understanding of teaching and learning challenges more broadly. Therefore we can talk about first-year students' difficulties with reading, writing, speaking, arguing and so on in fields new to them, and provide specific examples of such difficulties and perhaps how to address them. Potentially, there is a danger that these student challenges are seen as particular instances of learning difficulties. However, we think it is more useful to think about the kinds of difficulties novice students have in terms of discourse and academic literacy. These terms condense a complex range of theoretical insights that abstract student learning dilemmas beyond the immediate contexts of specific students and specific teachers. Understanding these difficulties as the result of novices requiring epistemic access to a field, that is, needing to learn new ways of thinking, talking, arguing, writing and reading appropriate to the field, provides a way of seeing student difficulties as part of process of enculturation that can be successfully mediated by teachers.

It is possible to effect cumulative learning through relating ideas, concepts and theories to new contexts. Pedagogy and assessment tasks promote the development of meanings beyond the immediate and across multiple contexts. Thus participants are afforded many opportunities to explore teaching and learning challenges in terms of the particular contexts in which they occur, and then to explain them in the abstract theoretical terms that they engage with as part of the programme. In order for this pedagogic strategy to result in cumulative learning, participants are offered guidance as to how to apply these principles as explanatory frameworks to their practice. Without such guidance, Maton (forthcoming) warns there is a risk of participants' "understandings remaining rooted in their contexts."

The programme consists of four core modules and a research elective offered over two years. We believe that this prolonged engagement allows time for lecturers to begin to familiarise themselves with the field of HES and to relate the ideas to their own teaching contexts. The modules are sequenced in a specific order to serve pedagogical purposes. The first module offered is on *learning and teaching in higher education*. As programme facilitators, our primary interest is in contributing to student learning; we believe that it is essential for participants at the start of the programme to be given the opportunity to engage with issues related to student learning, and for them to explore ways in which they can facilitate students' epistemological access in their disciplines. This is followed by a module on *curriculum development*. In this module

participants engage with the principles of curriculum development. In particular, we focus on enabling lecturers to develop curricula in which the purpose of the programme is aligned to teaching, learning and assessment processes. At this point in the programme, participants are able to use their understanding of the nature of their disciplines and their knowledge of student learning, to make decisions about the most appropriate ways of selecting, sequencing and pacing curriculum content for their courses. The second year begins with a module on the *assessment of student learning,* the purpose of which is to encourage participants to 'reimagine' their assessment practices by exploring *inter alia* the distinction between assessment *of* and assessment *for* learning. Furthermore, the notion of devising a coherent approach to assessing student learning is promoted as an integral part of developing curricula. In the second semester of the second year, a module on the *evaluation of teaching and courses* is offered. At this stage, we believe that programme participants are able to use their knowledge of learning, teaching, assessment and curriculum to devise and implement sound and principled ways of evaluating their courses and their teaching. Contrary to common understandings of evaluation as being only for accountability purposes, central to this module is the idea that evaluation should be viewed as a form of research in which lecturers critically interrogate their own practices for the primary purpose of improving teaching and learning. It is also at this point that participants may be able to understand evaluation as more than quality assurance, and to engage in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Finally, programme participants are required, for the *research elective,* to identify a particular aspect of their practice which they would like to research in more depth. For example, some lecturers choose to research issues related to postgraduate supervision, the use of information and communication technologies in teaching and learning, leadership roles in higher education, service learning, and so on. It is our hope that throughout their teaching careers, participants will build on this scholarly approach to teaching and learning to which they are introduced.

Over the last decade we have experimented with offering the programme in two different formats: a block format and a weekly format. In the former, each module is offered over the course of a week of contact sessions, with electronic communication between programme participants, and with facilitators between block sessions. In the latter, there are weekly contact sessions in which cohorts of participants meet for one-and-a-half hours each week during the academic year. In our experience, this format has been pedagogically sound because through weekly tasks and readings, participants' engagement with programme processes and materials has been sustained, and has frequently resulted in deeper levels of engagement.

Assessment

As noted above, instructional discourse includes the selection, sequencing and pacing of curriculum content and pedagogic processes. In addition it includes what Bernstein (1996, 2000) calls *evaluation,* which we prefer to call assessment of student learning, in order to distinguish it from the evaluation of teaching and courses. Assessment is governed by evaluative rules. Bernstein distinguishes between *recognition rules* and *realisation rules*. If participants understand the recognition rules, it means that they are able to 'read' a context and understand the rules that govern ways of being in that context. In the context of the programme, participants come to understand, for example, that teaching is a scholarly activity, and that their teaching practices ideally need to be congruent with their espoused theories of teaching and learning. However, Bernstein's distinction highlights that knowing what to do is not sufficient; participants also need to be able to realise the required performance. They demonstrate realisation rules when they are able to articulate their understanding of educative processes, using the appropriate disciplinary discourse of the field of HES. They explore ways in which they have mastered these realisation rules in relation to their classroom practice in the assignments and tasks which are part of the assessment processes of the programme. These are discussed below.

Congruent with our respect for disciplinary differences and our understanding of teaching and learning as context-dependent, it is particularly in the assessment processes of the programme that participants are expected to relate their knowledge of HES to teaching and learning in their particular disciplines and contexts. We noted earlier that we select the curriculum content, but that participants should decide whether and how this content relates to their own orientation to their discipline and their pedagogic practice. In addition, participants are encouraged to find more material related to teaching and learning in their disciplines which they can use as tools to think about their practice, and which can be integrated into their module assignments. We think that participating lecturers should have some control of the pedagogic device of the programme, with the programme assignments in particular, offering the sites for exercising this control.

Programme facilitators do not prescribe to participants what kind of teacherly identity they should adopt or how they should design courses, teach or assess their own students. Like Pratt (2002) we contend that there is no one way of being a teacher in higher education. Below we explain some of the assessment processes of the programme, and show how participants can demonstrate mastery of the evaluative rules of the programme as well as ways in which participants can exercise control of the pedagogic device of the programme while at the same time developing the

pedagogical expertise to enable them to shape the pedagogic device in their own teaching contexts in principled ways.

The assessment of the programme is both formative and summative with the emphasis on formative assessment, in order to give participants the opportunity to acquire the evaluative rules for the programme. Participants receive detailed formative feedback on all formative tasks and assignments, so that they can understand and internalise the evaluative criteria of the programme. Formative assessment takes the form of weekly reading tasks, journal tasks and reflective tasks. The weekly tasks are designed as scaffolding for the module assignment. At the end of each module participants submit an integrated, authentic assignment in which they provide evidence of having met all the outcomes for the module. All the assignments require participants to relate their beliefs and practices to the theory, and to reflect critically on ways of enhancing their teaching to ensure epistemological access and higher order learning for their students. An integral part of each assignment is the requirement to design, implement and theorise an intervention/innovation in their practice. In addition they are required to provide evidence of having evaluated the innovation/intervention and of having critically reflected on how and whether it has met its pedagogical purposes.

For the summative assessment of the programme as a whole, the participants are required to compile an integrated portfolio, using the assignments completed for the four core modules and the research elective module. The purpose of the portfolio is to document their development as teachers in higher education over the two years of participating in the formal programme. They are required to provide evidence of the way in which they manage their different roles as educators, based on a coherent theoretical and philosophical understanding of teaching and learning in higher education. Like Brew, we believe that "[t]he idea of scholarship (is) not as an activity, but rather … a quality of the way academic work is or should be done" (Brew 2010:108). We encourage lecturers to adopt a scholarly approach in relation to their pedagogic roles throughout the programme, and it is evidence of this approach that needs to be demonstrated in the summative assessment portfolio.

Conclusion

> The ultimate aim of professional development activity is to improve the quality of teaching and learning to the benefit of the students (D'Andrea & Gosling 2005:66).

For more than a decade we have been offering a Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education for university lecturers. Over time, as a result of insights gained through

our scholarly approach to programme design and feedback from our participants, the programme has evolved and developed considerably. Although we are aware that no course works equally well for everyone, we agree with Pawson that "[t]he net effect of any particular programme is thus made up of the balance of successes and failures of individual subjects" (2004:30-31). For us, the question is not whether the programme 'worked' but rather whether the epistemic-pedagogic device of the curriculum enabled participants to make it work. There is no expectation that it worked in the same way for everyone. However, feedback from a participant such as, "The PG Dip (Higher Education) had a profound impact on my thinking about teaching which has impacted on my practice … It profoundly changed the way I view teaching and learning as well as learners …" lead us to believe that the programme is achieving its aims.

Our analysis enabled us to provide an explanation of the general principles which underpin the recontextualisation from the field of HES into a pedagogy for a staff development programme. Using Bernstein's concept of the pedagogic device, we have described both the regulative and instructional discourses of the programme. Our analysis has shown that the programme is regulated by four key axiological principles, namely epistemological access for students, valuing of participants' disciplinary differences, developing participants as reflexive practitioners, and disrupting lecturers' everyday conceptions about teaching and learning. We believe that all academic staff development should explicitly evidence a value base such as this.

Owing to the diverse nature of the field of HES and the range of disciplinary backgrounds of participants, there are few clear 'rules' for the instructional discourse for a course for lecturers. However, it is useful for course designers to make explicit the basis for the selection of curriculum content and to examine the ways in which the instructional discourse is informed by the regulative discourse. In the case of the formal programme analysed in this chapter, we consider that selection of content is predominantly governed by the axiological principle of epistemological access. The analysis has shown that in terms of sequencing and pacing, the programme achieved fidelity to all the axiological principles which we identified, and it facilitated the constant move between theory and practice which is necessary in a professional course which faces both ways. The analysis alerted us to the importance of the curriculum evincing a balance between contextual and conceptual coherence. In the chapter we also briefly describe how, through formative and summative assessment, we ensure that we make clear to our participants what Bernstein calls the 'evaluative rules' of the programme. Through engagement with the assessment tasks throughout the two-year duration of the programme and as a result of extensive

formative feedback by programme facilitators and peers, opportunities are provided for participating lecturers to gain both the recognition and realisation rules of the most appropriate principles and practices for good teaching in their disciplines.

In the next chapter, our analysis of the PG Dip (Higher Education) is elaborated by using Maton's extension of Bernstein's model in terms of the epistemic-pedagogic device, to further examine the role of knowledge and knowers in the curriculum.

References

Ballard B & Clanchy J. 1988. Literacy in the University: An 'Anthropological' Approach. In: BBG Taylor, V Beasley, V Bock, J Clanchy & P Nightingale (eds). *Literacy by Degrees*. Milton Keynes: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press. 7-23.

Barnett M. 2006. Vocational knowledge and vocational pedagogy. In: M Young & J Gamble (eds). *Knowledge, curriculum and qualification for South African Further Education*. Pretoria: Human Sciences Research Council Press.

Becher T & Trowler P. 2001. *Academic Tribes and Territories: Intellectual Enquiry and the Culture of Disciplines* (Second edition). Maidenhead: Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press.

Bernstein B. 1996. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Bernstein B. 2000. *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control, and Identity: Theory, Research, Critique*. Critical perspectives series (Revised edition). Lanham, Md: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Boughey C. 2002. 'Naming' Students' Problems: an analysis of language-related discourses at a South African university. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 7(3):295-307.

Boyer EL. 1990. *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brew A. 2010. Transforming academic practice through scholarship. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 15(2):105-116.

Clegg S. 2005. Evidence-based practice in educational research: a critical realist critique of systematic review. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 26(3):415-428. doi:10.1080/01425690500128932.

D'Andrea V & Gosling D. 2005. *Improving teaching and learning in higher education. A whole institution approach*. Berkshire: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Haggis T. 2003. Constructing Images of Ourselves? A Critical Investigation into "Approaches to Learning" Research in Higher Education. *British Educational Research Journal*, 29(1):89-104. doi:10.1080/0141192032000005740.

Kandlbinder P & Peseta T. 2009. Key concepts in postgraduate certificates in higher education teaching and learning in Australasia and the United Kingdom. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(1):19-31. doi:10.1080/13601440802659247.

Kandlbinder P & Peseta T (eds). 2011. *Higher Education Research & Development Anthology*. Milperra, NSW: HERDSA.

Leibowitz B, Cilliers F, Du Plessis J, Kafaar Z, Van der Merwe A, Viljoen S & Young G. 2011. Orientations to academic development: lessons from a collaborative study at a research-led university. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(1):19-32. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2011.546214.

Light G & Cox R. 2000. *Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: The Reflective Professional*. London: Sage.

Luckett K & Luckett T. 2009. The development of agency in first generation learners in higher education: a social realist analysis. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 14(5):469-481. doi:10.1080/13562510903186618.

Lueddeke G. 2003. Professionalising Teaching Practice in Higher Education: A study of disciplinary variation and "teaching-scholarship". *Studies in Higher Education*, 28(2):213-228. doi:10.1080/0307507032000058082.

Manathunga C. 2007. "Unhomely" Academic Developer Identities: More post-colonial explorations. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 12(1):25-34. doi:10.1080/13601440701217287.

Mann SJ. 2001. Alternative perspectives on the student experience: alienation and engagement. *Studies in Higher Education*, 26(1):7-19.

Marshall D & Case J. 2005. "Approaches to learning" research in higher education: a response to Haggis. *British Educational Research Journal*, 31(2):257-267. doi:10.1080/014119205200340242.

Maton K. 2011. Knowledge-building. Analysing the cumulative development of ideas. In: G Ivinson, B Davies & J Fitz (eds). *Knowledge and Identity. Concepts and applications in Bernstein's sociology*. London: Routledge. 23-38.

Maton K. (Forthcoming). Knowledge and Knowers: Towards a realist sociology of education. London: Routledge.

Maton K & Moore R (eds). 2010. *Social Realism, Knowledge and the Sociology of Education. Coalitions of the Mind*. London: Continuum.

Mills D & Huber MT. 2005. Anthropology and the Educational "Trading Zone". *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 4(1):9-32. doi:10.1177/1474022205048756.

Morrow WE. 1993. Entitlement and achievement in education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 13(1):33-47.

Morrow WE. 2007. *Learning to Teach in South Africa*. Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Muller J. 2008. In search of coherence: a conceptual guide to curriculum planning for comprehensive universities. Unpublished report for the SANTED project.

Northedge A. 2003a. Rethinking Teaching in the Context of Diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(1):17-32. doi:10.1080/1356251032000052302.

Northedge A. 2003b. Enabling Participation in Academic Discourse. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8(2):169-180. doi:10.1080/1356251032000052429.

Pawson R. 2004. Evidence-based policy: a realist perspective. In: B Carter & C New (eds). *Making realism work. Realist social theory and empirical research*. London/New York: Routledge. 26-49.

Peseta TL. 2011. Professing in the field of academic development: is content a dirty word? *International Journal for Academic Development*, 16(1):83-86. doi:10.1080/1360144X.2011.546241.

Pratt DD. 2002. Good Teaching: One Size Fits All? *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (93):5-16. doi:10.1002/ace.45.

Rowland S. 2001. Surface learning about teaching in higher education: The need for more critical conversations. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2):162-167. doi:10.1080/13601440110033.

Scott I. 2009. First-Year Experience as Terrain of Failure or Platform for Development? Critical Choices for Higher Education. In: B Leibowitz, A van der Merwe & S van Schalkwyk (eds). *Focus on First-Year Success: Perspectives emerging from South Africa and beyond.* Stellenbosch: SUN PReSS.

Scott I, Yeld N & Hendry J. 2007. A case for improving teaching and learning in South African higher education. *Higher Education Monitor*, 6.

Shay S. 2012 (In press). Educational development as a field: Are we there yet? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(3).

Volbrecht T & Boughey C. 2004. Curriculum responsiveness from the margins? A reappraisal of Academic Development in South Africa. In: H Griesel (ed.). *Curriculum responsiveness: Case studies in higher education*. Pretoria: South African Universities Vice-Chancellors Association. 57-80.

Wheelahan L. 2010. *Why Knowledge Matters in Curriculum. A social realist argument.* London: Routledge.

Scott I, Yeld N & Hendry J. 2007. A case for improving teaching and learning in South African higher education. *Higher Education Monitor*, 6.

Shalem Y & Slonimsky L. 2010. Seeing epistemic order: construction and transmission of evaluative criteria. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 31(6):755-778.

Shay S. 2011. Curriculum formation: A case study from History. *Studies in Higher Education*, 36(3):315-329.

Shay S. 2012 (In press). Educational development as a field: Are we there yet? *Higher Education Research and Development*, 31(3).

Taylor G, Ballard B, Beasley V, Bock V, Clanchy J & Nightingale P. 1988. *Literacy by degrees*. Milton Keynes: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Toohey S. 1999. *Designing courses for higher education*. Philadelphia, Pa: Open University Press.

Vorster J. 2011. Disciplinary shifts in higher education. In: G Ivinson, B Davies & J Fitz (eds). *Knowledge and Identity: Bernsteinian approaches and applications*. London: Routledge.

Wheelahan L. 2010. *Why Knowledge Matters in Curriculum. A social realist argument*. London: Routledge.

Young MFD. 2008. *Bringing knowledge back in: from social constructivism to social realism in the sociology of education*. London: Routledge.