

Partnering with the academy to enhance educational integrity: lessons learnt at the coalface

Dallas Wingrove and Kylie Budge
RMIT University, Australia

Abstract Educational integrity lies at the heart of a university's capacity to contribute to the wider social context through learning, teaching, research and scholarship. As our institution and the sector identifies, the capacity of the university to contribute to a functional and meaningful society is predicated upon this core value. This paper seeks to build knowledge of how academic developers, through partnership with diverse academic communities, can actively foster a capacious and collective ownership of, and responsibility for, educational integrity in higher education. The authors who are both academic developers present two case studies where the imperative for change was to support and enhance the educational integrity of learning and teaching programs within the disciplines of Engineering and the Built Environment in our university. In doing so, we critically reflect on our experience of partnering with academics outside our discipline of academic development and explore the questions: What different conceptions of educational integrity can emerge when different disciplinary tribes are compelled to partner? How do academic developers negotiate change in light of these different conceptions, and ensure that the core principles of honesty, trust and respect are played out on the ground? We argue that fostering a discourse of integrity that transcends the discipline boundaries is fundamental to truly embedding principles of academic integrity in the university culture. This in turn significantly challenges the institution to implement resourced and strategic policy and practices in support of lasting, positive change.

Key Ideas

The key ideas explored in this paper are:

- Academic development as an agent for change to support educational integrity: institutional enablers and impediments to realising it's potential
- Conflicting conceptions of educational integrity-the individual, the discipline community, the institution- and the implications for the enhancement of educational integrity
- Understanding, respecting and building on diverse ways of knowing and academic identity to foster educational integrity
- Defining and negotiating curriculum and pedagogic change to enhance educational integrity
- Educational integrity: top down policy initiatives vs. support for curriculum and pedagogic reform on the ground the institutional implications
- Academic developers as reflective practitioners.

Discussion Question 1: How can universities sustain and enhance educational integrity by building on the different perceptions of educational integrity held by their academic communities?

Discussion Question 2: What are the challenges, logistics and benefits of collaborating across the discipline borders to enhance educational integrity?

Introduction

University mission statements commonly articulate aspirational statements underpinned by core principles of educational integrity. How these principles are in turn played out on the ground now forms an area of specialised research, both in the Australian sector and internationally (Volpe, Davidson & Bell, 2008; Hudd, Apgar, Bronson & Lee, 2009). In a sector driven by performance and quality measurement (Blackmore, 2005), the discipline of academic development has emerged as an agent for change in support of these desired principles and offers the potential to actively foster and enhance educational integrity in higher

education. This includes through the creation of a cross disciplinary discourse community.

This paper seeks to contribute to understandings of the enhancement of integrity in learning and teaching by exploring the implications, challenges and opportunities inherent in bridging discipline and epistemological divides. The authors present two case studies of academic development involving partnerships with the disciplines of Engineering and the Built Environment, and critically examine some of the tensions and issues academic developers can confront at the coal face. In doing so, we seek to illuminate enablers and impediments to the enactment of educational integrity in the discipline and wider culture.

Implicit in teaching practice in higher education are significant pedagogical challenges and opportunities which can enhance educational integrity. As our case studies explore, such challenges and opportunities can include fostering socially aware practice through public scholarship and assessing our students to improve learning. In reflecting on our practice from the perspective of academic developers, we seek to offer a contribution to an under-researched dimension of educational integrity and explore its enactment in relation to rigour and scholarship in learning and teaching.

We adopt Boyer's (1990) conception of teaching scholarship which identifies teachers who, as well informed, foster active learning, encourage their students to think critically and creatively and cultivate students' capacity to continue learning. Accordingly, the scholarship of teaching goes beyond knowledge transmission and dissemination, to encompass the extension of knowledge through pedagogy. As Boyer identifies, such teachers see themselves as both "scholars and learners" (Boyer, 1990, p. 23).

As Boyer (1990) further defines, the scholarship of teaching has an intrinsic integrity that is integrated with the three other forms of scholarship he identifies: the discovery, application and integration of knowledge. Teaching as scholarship importantly encompasses a rigorous approach to teaching practice and the application of good teaching practices within the discipline. Such rigour includes adopting an evidence-based approach to change through discipline based pedagogic research and supporting and enabling good teaching practice through innovation. As scholarship, teaching practice also encompasses critical reflection on practice and the communication and dissemination of pedagogic practice within the academy (Boyer, 1990). Creating respectful sites for this exchange, both within and across disciplines is, we consider, fundamental to building a collective ownership of principles of academic integrity. Underpinning this vision is the nexus between teaching, learning and research.

As we explore through our case studies, rigour and scholarship in learning and teaching are fundamental to educational integrity. Our conception of educational integrity as articulated through this paper thus goes beyond the more widely researched area of integrity violations which include academic misconduct, intellectual property and authorship, research ethics, cheating and plagiarism. In this paper, we consider the enactment of integrity in light of different conceptions: as held by the institution, the academy and ourselves as academic developers (Budge, Clarke & de la Harpe, 2007; Kember & Kwan, 2000; Prosser & Trigwell, 1996) and apply the notion of conception to describe "the meaning an individual ascribes to his or her perception or experience of a particular practice or phenomenon" (Light & Calkins, 2008, p. 28). What emerged through our partnering with the academy was that notions of educational integrity at times aligned and conflicted. As we crossed the discipline borders, we were compelled

to confront and attempt to build on these different conceptions, including those which sat at the margins of our university's and sector wide educational imperatives and learning and teaching agendas.

The implications of our findings and orientations to practice are discussed in the latter sections of this paper and are analysed in relation to the enactment and embedding of educational integrity in different disciplines and the wider university culture. By exploring and reflecting on the challenges, opportunities and issues that emerged, we seek to build knowledge of institutional enablers and barriers to sustaining and enhancing educational integrity in higher education, to ultimately ensure that the aspirations embedded within these principles are realised and enacted in the wider university culture.

Methodology

A critical reflection and case study approach underpin this paper. We adopt the case study methodology as a way to frame our critical reflections of the issues we encountered in seeking to enhance the integrity of learning and teaching through curriculum reform and educational change projects. As a methodology it provides an approach with sufficient depth in which to understand the complex human and organisational phenomena (Burns, 2000) which characterise the discipline of academic development. In our exploration of the various issues of educational integrity we encountered we describe and reflect upon two case studies. The first was a partnership with the academics in an Engineering faculty to foster students' social and civic engagement through community based educational partnerships. The second was partnering with academics from a Built Environment faculty to gather data from first year undergraduate students about their expectations and experiences of first semester.

In conjunction with this we locate our case studies within a continuum of reflective practice as defined by Wellington and Austin (1996). To do this we reflect on our practice as academic developers working with faculty academics in two different cases. This reflection informs our decisions when locating faculty academics and ourselves on this continuum. The continuum, encompassing what Wellington and Austin (1996) define as 'domesticating to liberating orientations' provides a lens for understanding academics' decisions and values about the role of reflective practice in teaching and learning. In addition, this continuum provides an appropriate lens through which academics' conceptions of the purpose of education can be illuminated. By understanding how we, and the academics with whom we partnered conceptualise this purpose, conceptions of educational integrity can in turn be more fully discerned.

Academic Development: Agency and change at the coalface

Academic development is a diverse and emerging discipline in higher education. Due to its diversity in focus and practice both within Australia and internationally, it is defined with some difficulty by Macdonald (2009) but more specifically by Candy as "practices designed to enhance the academic performance of an institution of higher education" (as cited in Macdonald, 2009, p. 428), and by Brew as referring "to the numerous activities which have to do with the professional learning of academics in post-compulsory, tertiary or higher education" (as cited in Macdonald, 2009, p. 428).

Further, the practice and scholarship of academic development are underpinned by identification with the notion of change. As Land (2001) identifies "Academic developers, unlike other professional groups, have no vested interest in maintaining the status quo" (Land, 2001, p.10). By its nature, the practice of academic development thus creates "a site for encounter or contest" (Webb as cited in Land, 2001, p.1) and as such is located in a contested space somewhat external from 'traditional' academic disciplines. Inherent in this encounter is the rich potential to foster and enhance educational integrity in higher education.

Ideally, academic developers contribute to institutional priorities in ways that help the institution, academic units and individuals meet their goals, and which are intrinsically respectful to institutional and individual integrity. Yet as the literature identifies (Reid, 2002; Light & Calkins, 2008; Manathunga 2006; Land, 2001), the practice of academic development is also characterised by an ambiguity and complexity since academic developers often seek to foster change through engagement with discipline communities which are external to their own, and which thus require the building of a discourse community beyond a common body of knowledge. Situated along side this complexity, as Trowler (2002) explains, are the equally complex issues regarding the pace and process of change in higher education. These include various cultural, institutional and policy related dimensions that have become the background narrative to practice at a local level.

The practice of academic development also comprises diverse leadership, teaching and learning, research and service roles (Harland & Staniforth, 2003; Macdonald, 2009). As teacher, academic developers can assume the role of fostering the integrity of learning and teaching through the contribution of their discipline and institutional knowledge, and through distributed leadership and change management. As student, academic developers seek to understand the distinct norms, values and ways of knowing which define the discipline with whom they partner. As the roles of student and teacher are played out on the ground, academic developers are challenged to negotiate change through a partnered exploration which supports and respects diverse values and beliefs as held by the individual, the discipline community and the institution. As our case studies explore, such partnered exploration can bring to the fore diverse conceptions of academic and professional identity and integrity.

In the following section we examine how we sought to negotiate change to foster educational integrity in light of such differing conceptions, and explore the efficacy of fostering a unifying framework across the multiplication of knowledges, discourses and epistemologies which characterise the university community.

Case studies

One: Enhancing Educational Integrity: Curriculum reform

The first case study upon which we reflect describes a partnership with the academy to foster students' social and civic engagement through community based educational partnerships. Community engagement learning is underpinned by an ethic and imperative to contribute to community and the society through public scholarship. In the Australian university context community engagement exists in many different forms: in centres of community policy and research; as a strategy to recruit potential students and to further embed the university in its wider geographical or social community; and as community engagement learning - learning that enhances learning, teaching and research through the design and development of learning experiences that reach out beyond the university to

enact social and civic engagement. It is the enhancement of educational integrity through this third kind of engagement that this case study explores.

Educational Integrity through community engagement

In 2002, the first author, who was then working in a centralised Community Engagement Education Unit within the university, was approached by two academics representing two distinct disciplines from within the university's Engineering faculty who were interested to explore the development of learning through community outreach. In particular, the Engineering academics were seeking to actively foster graduate attributes which would effectively prepare students for their future professional practice by creating learning experiences in which students integrated and applied their knowledge, skills and human qualities in authentic learning sites (Biggs, 2003; Bowden & Marton, 1998; Stephenson & Yorke, 1998).

From the author's perspective, the overarching impetus for this engagement was to address what were then university access and equity targets and to foster social and civic dimensions of learning for undergraduates through their critical engagement in wider socio political contexts. A volunteer program *Rockets in Schools* was subsequently developed by the author, with 75 second and third year engineering undergraduates working in primary schools in Melbourne's western and northern regions between the period of 2001-2003. As volunteers, these undergraduates worked with primary school students designing, building and launching rockets with, in most cases, community partnerships formed with primary schools identified as socio economically disadvantaged.

In 2004 a second phase of academic development occurred. This partnership, formed between the author and the same two engineering academics, led to the development of the elective '*Engineering in the Community*'. Our shared interest in developing this curriculum lay not just in creating opportunities for students to be exposed to a set of experiences otherwise not widely available within the university, and to foster the development of graduate attributes, but to also create learning experiences for our students which created the possibility of the negotiation of meaning through engagement in learning and paradigms that inform identity. For the two engineering academics, preparation for professional practice was central to their conception of identity and to the purpose of higher education. From the author's perspective, and based on formal and informal discussions with members of the wider faculty including senior academic management, the wider faculty considered discipline knowledge as core to pedagogic integrity.

The author's conception of educational integrity however went beyond preparation for professional practice and the acquisition of discipline knowledge. For the author, educational integrity foregrounded the notion of social and civic engagement through the creation of learning experiences for students which fostered an expectation of and commitment to public scholarship. The author's conception of public scholarship was underpinned by a reciprocal exchange of knowledge.

Conflicting conceptions of educational integrity

The author's perspectives of the Engineering faculty and senior management discussed here were based upon both formal discussions via learning and teaching meetings, and informal discussions with academics. The author's

perceptions of the wider academy were also informed by the views of the two engineering academics with whom the author partnered. These academics wanted to implement pedagogic change, to foreground a problem based learning approach to teaching and learning within the faculty. They too had experienced resistance which in part provided the impetus for them to seek a partnership with the author.

As conceptions of curriculum, teaching and learning integrity practice conflicted, the author's endeavour to embed *Engineering in the Community* in the wider Engineering faculty failed. On the one hand, a model of community outreach that was ultimately shown to enhance the student experience and the quality of students' learning was created, but on the other, the author was not able to forge a deeper and sustainable engagement with the wider Engineering faculty. By the time the elective was developed, work readiness through industry engagement was also now privileged by our university, and had subsumed the now former imperative for public scholarship.

The elective, met with resistance by members of the wider academy, was irretrievably positioned at the margins of the discipline community. From the author's perspective, the wider academy, including senior academic management, did not perceive this learning as core to learning and teaching, and it was lost eventually as its champions left. This in part at least reflects the increasing administrative, performance measurement, and teaching and research accountabilities and pressures that impact on academics' practice and workloads. The reality is that innovations such as *Engineering in the Community* are time and resource rich, and place additional financial pressures on the already constrained university and on senior academic management who must negotiate change whilst meeting seemingly corporate accountabilities.

From the author's perspective, the experience of academic development can also be characterised by what Bath and Smith (2004) identify as "disciplinary externality and diversity" (p. 18). Fostering a shared conception of educational integrity requires a complex bridging of disciplinary divides and traditions in ways which are respectful of disciplinary ways of knowing. For academic developers, this challenge can be compounded when positioned as outsiders to the discipline community.

Rather than a linear, content driven approach to teaching and learning, *Rockets* and *Engineering in the Community* had engaged students in informal and formal learning as a meaning making process that was open to negotiation, debate and to exposure to the interests, identities and ways of knowing held by diverse community partners. For the wider Engineering academy, this represented a challenge to their conception of curriculum integrity: to the supremacy of discipline knowledge, to more dominant didactic ways of knowing within the discipline, and to the privileging of work based sites of learning as preparation for professional practice, sites which were at the same time now privileged by our university.

The author's conception of curriculum integrity foregrounded public scholarship whereby students' engagement in the social practice of engineering went beyond a conception of higher education as preparation for professional practice, to encompass social and civic responsibility. Yet, the pedagogy of community engagement learning was clearly challenging to the wider engineering academy's conception of discipline and pedagogic integrity and represented a paradigm shift from the still dominant discipline model of knowledge transmission to student centred experiential, problem based learning. Learning through the experience of engaging with community further challenged the notion of teacher as expert as

students engaged in the 'messiness' of learning: of integrating and applying their knowledge, skills and qualities in real life, diverse community settings. As Barrie (2004) notes, such ways of learning are tantamount to many academics' conceptions and experience of teaching practice.

Further, large classes of 100 or more were commonly taught within the faculty. The author by contrast occupied a privileged position since the elective was taught in relatively small classes of no more than 25 students. As the literature confirms (Biggs, 2003; Ramsden, 2003), teaching in large classes has a fundamental impact on pedagogic practice, and the capacity for innovation and experimentation. In this respect, the author occupied a position of privilege through which pedagogic change could be enacted.

In the mass education environment, and in light of the often siloed nature of teaching practice in higher education, actively fostering a shared teaching scholarship and rigor is highly challenging. As this case study has explored, building educational knowledge and integrity can include through partnerships between academic developers and academics to bring about curriculum innovation. Yet fostering a shared ownership and conception of educational integrity through rigour and scholarship requires the time to reflect, to build partnerships within and across the disciplines, and the time for discipline based pedagogic research to ensure an evidence base for curriculum innovation and pedagogic practice. As explored here, a myriad of factors can impede this endeavour.

Rockets in Schools and *Engineering in the Community* had, from the author's perspective, created sites for student centred, cross disciplinary learning and most importantly encouraged an expectation of, and commitment to, public scholarship through social and civic engagement. For the academics with whom the author partnered, the ethic of public scholarship, though recognised, was subsumed by a conception of education which foregrounded work readiness and preparation for professional practice through problem based learning. For members of the wider Engineering academy, community engagement learning was viewed as marginal to discipline knowledge and expertise. Yet it is also important to reiterate that the capacity of the wider Engineering academy to engage with the pedagogic principles which underpinned *Engineering in the Community* was negatively impacted upon by the constraints and pressures which can characterise the lived experiences of teachers in higher education.

Two: Enhancing educational Integrity: Giving voice to the student learning journey

The context

The second case study on which we reflect describes partnering with academics from a Built Environment faculty to gather data from first year undergraduate students about their expectations and experiences of first semester at the university in 2008. The process of exploring this data with faculty academics revealed conceptions of academic integrity that conflicted with those as espoused by the institution and those held by the second author.

While working as an academic developer in a unit external from the faculty, a first year expectations and experiences study was initiated in consultation and with permission from the lecturer of a large, core first year class. The author had worked with both the lecturer and the faculty over a number of years on a variety

of learning and teaching projects and had developed a positive relationship with both. Through this work over time it became apparent that we, the discipline academics and the author, held and valued different conceptions of educational integrity. However, this difference in views on a range of educational issues, including the importance of scholarship and rigour in learning and teaching, had not previously manifested as a major obstacle to working relationships or to wider project goals.

Academics teaching first year students in the discipline had expressed their dissatisfaction with the overall attitude and low attendance rates of their students and were keen to explore explanations for this behaviour. The idea for exploring student perceptions on expectations and experiences of first year was informed by first year transition literature (see for example Krause, 2005; Kift, 2008; Krause, Hartley, James & McInnes, 2005; Tinto, 2002) and developed as a way of gaining a deeper insight into some of the issues the academics were experiencing in their classes, and also as a means of better understanding first year students enrolled in the faculty.

Quantitative and qualitative survey data was collected from students via two surveys as a way of supplementing and deepening understandings of findings from standardised university surveys, and as a method for informing learning and teaching initiatives and to enhance the student experience by supporting first year student transition. It is not possible within the scope of this paper to discuss the findings of the study in detail. However, analysis of data on the student experience indicates first semester was experienced as 'fair', but not as overwhelmingly positive or negative. In addition, the frequency and strength of the comments in the qualitative data collected suggested that there were genuine issues for students that required interpretation, reflection, planning and action by academics teaching first year.

Differing conceptions of educational integrity

It was through the process of discussing the findings of the student surveys with faculty academics that differing conceptions about educational integrity were illuminated. In particular, most academics were unable to believe or accept the students' qualitative feedback about the need for changes in the timing of assessment, feedback on student work, and assessment criteria information. In fact the qualitative feedback was angrily dismissed by many academics teaching first year and staff became noticeably defensive and resistant to discussions about using the findings of the study to inform changes in teaching practice. On reflection the resistance could be attributed to a number of possible reasons: staff holding a negative view about the role of qualitative data in research (even though quantitative data was also collected and validated the findings in the qualitative data); that the data collected via the two surveys was not representative of student opinions (though 61% of the first year cohort responded to the first survey and 36% to the second); that the findings implied the need for a change in practice requiring time in a busy academic's schedule; and more broadly, that the findings challenged staff about learning and teaching on a level they felt uncomfortable with and were not ready or able to address.

The practice of examining the student feedback via the survey findings brought to the foreground the different conceptions of education integrity held by the author and many academics within the discipline, including the ability to reflect on practice and create the necessary and corresponding changes. Chapfika (2008) claims this flexibility and willingness to change is core to working with integrity in educational contexts:

“Although integrity involves discerning, holding on to and acting on what is admirable, teachers and learners of integrity are flexible and incorporate failure in their worldviews.” They are “aware of the tentative character of knowledge, and the need to adjust views considering new evidence” (p. 48).

Informing learning and teaching practice via student feedback was not perceived as a core or important practice by the discipline academics involved. In contrast, it was perceived as fundamentally important by the author, the university and the sector. By asking academics within the discipline to see it as such challenged them deeply by prioritising issues of pedagogical integrity over the supremacy of traditionally held disciplinary knowledge and practice. Furthermore, the changes to feedback and assessment practice at the heart of the survey findings call into question didactic ways of knowing and teaching, primarily reliant on knowledge transmission. It also requires academics to go beyond the domain of their discipline knowledge into the discipline of learning and teaching. This is challenging for several reasons, one being that the study of higher education, or as it is more commonly known the field of learning and teaching, is not even perceived as such by many academics. Similarly, it is often viewed as less important than the dominant discipline in which they are based.

The different conceptions of educational integrity could be attributed to a number of reasons including: belonging to different disciplinary tribes with different disciplinary ways of knowing; differing views about the role of student feedback in terms of informing practice; differing views about the role and value of qualitative data in research; differing beliefs about the value of reflective practice as praxis; variations in conceptions about teaching and learning; and contrasting views of what constitutes priority in learning, teaching and assessment. Interestingly the author and discipline academics held similar views on the wider institutional pressures placed on academics as the result of sector-wide changes to higher education in the last 15 years. It is in projects such as this one requiring curriculum reform and a potential change in practice where differing beliefs and views are illuminated, creating discomfort and anxiety for all involved. As Chapfika elaborates, “situations that call for integrity often arise in higher education, especially in the context of assessment” (2008, p. 48).

This case study highlights a key challenge: how do academic developers negotiate change in light of different conceptions of educational integrity when working on projects incorporating these values at their core, and ensure that the core principles of honesty, trust, respect and responsibility are played out on the ground?

Understanding conceptions of educational integrity

As a method for reflecting upon different conceptions of integrity and the role these played in our endeavour to enhance the integrity of learning and teaching in higher education, we applied Wellington and Austin’s (1996) orientations to reflective practice to the two case studies described earlier. The intention of using such a framework is not to categorise an academic or group of academics, including ourselves, but to use reflection as a means to stimulate and initiate a change in practice. As Wellington and Austin identify “When practitioners become aware of their own preferences and prejudices across modes, they can begin to reflect upon a wider range of questions and to develop a wider range of

responses....As researchers, we are especially interested in considering the ways in which practitioners might discover, reconsider or revise the values and beliefs which underlie their practice." (p. 314). This, we would advocate, lies at the heart of any critical engagement with principles of educational integrity.

The conceptual framework developed by Wellington and Austin identified five academic orientations to reflective practice which they categorised as immediate; technical; deliberative; dialectic; and transpersonal. These orientations are located along a continuum according to an academic's decisions and values about the role of reflective practice in teaching and learning. Each end of the continuum is framed as either having a 'domesticating' or 'liberating' tendency encompassing both systems and people-oriented dimensions.

Wellington and Austin define a domesticating tendency as practice that is principally concerned with encouraging or developing behaviours both in self and others and conforms to the expressed official or explicit purposes or mission of the institution, or its prevailing and influential normative cultures. These may be explicit and overt or implicit and covert. Many educators would probably align themselves with this tendency, understanding the role and purpose of education to be primarily concerned with focussing on the needs and development of the individual and society, without questioning established cultural norms or practices at a deeper transformative level. In contrast, a liberating tendency would indicate practice that is counter to these purposes and cultures, and seeks to transform them. Wellington and Austin explain this further: "in asking whether practitioners believe that education ought to be domesticating or liberating, we want to know how they conceive the purpose of education with respect to the relationship between individual and society" (1996, p. 313). The ideas underpinning the liberating tendency align with Friere's (1970) controversial views about education and the broader social purpose it plays in transforming society. That is the notion that education is not only about individual development but serves a more critical and radical purpose of changing society. Importantly there is no value judgement about 'good teaching' in terms of where an academic is placed along Wellington and Austin's continuum.

In the following table, we locate our case studies — (1) a partnership with the academics in an Engineering faculty to foster students' social and civic engagement through community based educational partnerships and (2) partnering with academics from a Built Environment faculty to gather data from first year undergraduate students about their expectations and experiences of first semester —in accordance with Wellington and Austin's (1996) five orientations to reflective practice. Each orientation is also located in relation to the meta categories of domesticating to liberating.

Table 1: Application of Wellington & Austin's (1996) Orientations to reflective practice framework to two case studies

	Domesticating			Liberating	
	Immediate	Technical	Deliberative	Dialectic	Transpersonal
Case Study 1 Participants	Group 2 X	Group 2 X	Group 1 X		
Case Study 2 Participants	X	X			
Author 1				X	X

Author 2				X	
----------	--	--	--	---	--

The author of case study one could be placed within the liberating domains of dialectic and transpersonal. As liberating, the author's conception of the purpose of higher education was grounded in the notion of transformative learning, which encompassed cultural and personal transformation. From the author's perspective, the purpose of higher education was to not only foster students' cognitive development, but to also develop students' worldviews through their critical interaction with a range of ethical, social and interpersonal issues, and through a partnered exploration of what it means to engage in a democratic pluralistic culture. Although during the latter stages of *Rockets in Schools*, and in the period in which the elective was developed and taught, work based learning agendas were subsuming learning through community engagement, the author sought to go beyond the dominant work based discourse, the dominant disciplinary ways of knowing and institutional financial and resourcing constraints, to enact her conception of educational integrity in teaching and learning.

The participants in case study one are defined as two distinct groups: the first group comprises the two academics with whom the author partnered; and the second the wider engineering academy. For the former group, the orientation to practice is located within a deliberative orientation. As Wellington and Austin identify, whilst individuals work within "authorised organisational structures, they may feel uncomfortable at times" (1996, p. 310). For the first group of academics, the dominant content driven pedagogy was perceived as lacking in meaning and relevance to their students. At the point of seeking a partnership, this group of academics had reconceptualised their teaching practice from one grounded in knowledge transmission to a more problem based experiential learning approach. In doing so, these academics had reflected, explored and embraced alternative teaching strategies. In their case, reflection was used to inform practice whilst established "educational ends" were also served (Wellington & Austin, 1996, p. 310), since their conception of preparation for professional practice reinforced the discursive practices which defined the engineering profession.

For the wider engineering academy, the orientation to practice is located within the immediate and technical domains, whereby the purpose of education provides "a vehicle through which the dominant culture is reinforced" (Wellington & Austin, 1996, p. 314). For this group, reflection facilitated conformity to established ways of working.

The decision to locate the participants according to these orientations was based on the author's reflections and on research undertaken subsequent to the demise of both *Rockets in Schools* and the elective *Engineering in the Community*. This research explored the scholarship and sustainability of community engagement learning (Wingrove & Alvarez, 2006). The author's reflections were also informed by the dissemination of practice across the wider sector through AUCEA (the Australian Universities Community Engagement Alliance).

The participants of case study two could be placed in both the 'immediate' and 'technical' orientations as this is where the majority of participants were located, with the exception of a small minority who could be placed in the 'dialectic' field. The decision about where to locate the participants was drawn from reflections of work with faculty academics in the scenario described above in case study two. Interestingly it aligns with the qualitative data on conceptions of teaching from the same participants in a previous but different study (Budge, Clarke & de la Harpe, 2007).

The author of the second case study, in contrast to many of the participants, could be located in the 'dialectic' domain. The author's decision to locate herself within the dialectic domain in the liberating end of Wellington and Austin's continuum is based on a reflection of her beliefs about education as developed over time through both practice and scholarship. These beliefs are largely derived from the notion of education acting as a key component for empowerment and change both on an individual and broader social level. A key philosophical influence underpinning the author's beliefs about education and the broader social role it plays is described in the work of Paulo Freire (1970) who was a sharp critic of the 'banking' concept of education and of the traditional student-teacher dichotomy.

However, it must be acknowledged that while the authors are able to explain their location on Wellington and Austin's continuum as part of this reflective paper, we recognise that we occupy a privileged position, given the faculty academics with whom we have worked have not been able to directly express their views. Indeed, further research in this particular area of educational integrity may well be strengthened by directly involving faculty academics in applying Wellington and Austin's model.

By applying Wellington and Austin's (1996) five orientations the differences between the case study participants and the author's own positioning along the continuum become evident. These orientations offer a useful insight into the different views on the purpose of education and raise issues for the enhancement of principles of educational integrity through a collective ownership by the academy. These issues are discussed in the following section.

Rhetoric or Reality: Bridging the divide to foster educational integrity

As a non hierarchical framework, Wellington and Austin's (1996) conceptual framework has illuminated distinct elements that comprise the academic culture in the disciplines of the Built Environment and Engineering within our institution. By recognising and deepening understandings of these distinct elements, universities may be better enabled to move positively forward towards the realisation of what Wellington and Austin define as "a larger more unified vision of educational practice" (p. 315). Moving beyond institutional rhetoric which presupposes compliance and conformity to institutional statements of integrity, and which assumes a shared conception of what these principles mean is, we would argue, vital to realising this vision.

Deepening understandings of academics' conceptions of the purpose of education, and their underlying orientations to teaching practice, creates the real potential for a platform upon which a collective understanding and ownership of principles of educational integrity can ultimately be built. As Wellington and Austin (1996) define, it is only when academics become aware of their own modes and orientations that they can engage in critical reflection and in turn be open to and begin to reflect upon questions and challenges beyond established ways of working. "Only then may academics discover, reflect on and even revise if they so choose the values and principles which define their practice" (p. 315).

As we have discussed, Wellington and Austin's (1996) framework is useful in terms of understanding the motivations and orientations of individual

practitioners, however, as others have highlighted, it is also important to understand the broader context of where individual academics are located. In relation to this Webb (as cited in Macdonald, 2009) offers this important insight:

“Development” is too often viewed as what we do to change people rather than how we change the system, processes and cultures in which individuals can locate their practices. (p. 436).

This statement is relevant in terms of reflecting on the broader context framing the two case studies that are the subject of this paper. In both case studies the imperative for change was to support and enhance the educational integrity of learning and teaching programs within university disciplines. The nature of the work required academics to make a change in practice on individual, program and faculty levels. In considering Webb’s statement above, change at the individual level is unrealistic unless wider institutional systems, processes and cultures also change to support them. Academics will be reluctant to invest in changing their practice and the risks that this entails unless a culture exists to encourage and support this at all institution and sector levels. Innovative, learner-centred practice requires resources, including time to absorb, reflect, think, plan and act.

The current tertiary sector climate is time and resource poor with staff subject to demands about research and teaching performance mostly driven by the quality agenda (Blackmore, 2005; Marginson & Considine, 2000). Contemporary academia requires staff to work within a framework of multiple competing pressures serving institutions which have characteristics similar to those of large corporations satisfying ‘customers’ to ensure a profit (Marginson & Considine, 2000). This wider context has an impact on the identity of academics and their corresponding ability and willingness to embrace and adopt new learning and teaching practices, and needs to be recognised at an institutional and sector level if we are serious about creating conditions that can sustain lasting change.

Academics’ differing perceptions of educational integrity reflect, at least in part, their attempts to understand and manage a variety of pressures emanating from this wider context. Education and curriculum change projects can be perceived as being of minor importance when an individual academic is faced with a number of competing demands and pressures in a time poor environment. As distinct and competing educational agendas and accountabilities to government, industry and community converge, the ambiguity and complexity of academic practice, including academic development, become significantly more pronounced (Land, 2001). Such ambiguity and complexity can impact negatively on the capacity of the institution, and the individuals within it, to foster educational integrity in a mass education environment.

Mechanisms by which the institution enacts supported rather than top-down change on the ground are vital to the advancement of educational integrity with, to date, a number of thoughtful models about how change occurs in teaching professions having been developed (Richardson, 1998; Shulman & Shulman, 2004). For academic developers, such models can enhance the negotiation of change in light of different conceptions and epistemologies (Hicks, 1999; Reid, 2002). Understanding and trialling change models can assist in ensuring that the core principles of educational integrity — honesty, trust and respect — are incorporated and upheld in learning and teaching change projects and offer a means of establishing a more thoughtful mode of practice.

Conclusions

In this paper we have examined and reflected on different conceptions of educational integrity that can emerge when different disciplinary tribes, specifically academic developers and academics from the disciplines, partner, in an attempt to enhance our endeavour to actively foster the integrity of teaching and learning.

In reflecting on our practice, our interest was to understand how integrity might be sustained and enhanced in light of different conceptions of the purpose of higher education, and to also explore how the core principles of honesty, trust, respect and responsibility might unfold in future projects involving partnerships with the academy. As Manathunga & Peseta (2007) identify, any endeavour to negotiate change in light of these differences needs to be framed within safe, respectful environments where meaningful change can develop over time.

As we have explored, ensuring the collective ownership of integrity lies at the heart of implementing lasting change in higher education, and involves a complex meaning making process. Our analysis leads us to this conclusion: there is a need to acknowledge and understand more deeply different conceptions of educational integrity held by academics. Further, we would argue that a scholarship of integrity is vital to its very enhancement: to the enactment of a unifying educational vision of, and commitment to, principles of educational integrity in higher education. As argued by Shulman 'For an activity to be considered scholarship it should manifest at least three key characteristics: It should be *public*, susceptible to *critical review and evaluation* and accessible for *exchange and use* by other members of one's scholarly community" (as cited in Bass, 1999, p. 2). The creation of cross disciplinary, discursive spaces in which practice can, as public, be critiqued, reviewed and exchanged is fundamental to building a meaningful and sustained engagement.

So too is recognising and understanding the motivations and orientations at the individual level as well as the wider context and the impact of both when working on projects involving principles of educational integrity. Moreover, there exists the genuine need for adequate resourcing of educational change projects to provide a workspace where competing pressures on all participants can be left (if only temporarily) at the door.

As our case studies explore, scholarship and rigour in learning and teaching is fundamental to the enhancement of academic integrity: to ensuring quality teaching and learning in higher education. For principles of academic integrity to be sustained and truly embedded within the discipline and institutional culture, teaching and learning practices need to be shared, critiqued and informed by a rigorous, evidence-based approach to practice and change through scholarship. This in turn needs to be appropriately supported and resourced by the institution.

Whilst institutional policy and missions presuppose conformity and compliance with mandated norms, values and standards, as Wellington & Austin (1996) identify, "Without critical reflection we run the risk of confining our understandings to unarticulated assumptions and conditions" (p. 308). If principles of educational integrity are to be truly embedded in the wider culture, assumptions about the supposedly homogeneous university community need to be made explicit, and diverse ways of knowing exchanged and more deeply understood. Only then can a discourse of integrity, transcendent of disciplinary divides, be actively fostered and ultimately embedded in the university culture.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge the work of the reviewers and thank them for their feedback and suggestions.

References

- Barrie, S. C. (2004) *Academics Understandings of Generic Attributes: a Framework for Assuring Quality*. Paper presented at the Australian Universities Quality Forum
- Bass, R. (1999) The Scholarship of Teaching: What's the problem? *Inventio: Creative Thinking about learning and teaching, Vol 1, No 1*
- Bath, D., & Smith, C. (2004). Academic Developers: An Academic Tribe Claiming their Territory in Higher Education. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 9(1), May 2004, 9-27.
- Biggs, J. (2003) *Teaching for Quality Learning at University*. Buckingham: The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press
- Blackmore, J. (2005). 'The emperor has no clothes': professionalism, performativity and educational leadership in high-risk modern times, in J. Collard and C. Reynolds (Eds), *Leadership, gender and culture in education: male and female perspectives*, 173-194, UK: Open University Press.
- Bowden, M. & Marton, J. (1998) *The University of Learning*. London: Kogan Page
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship revisited*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Budge, K., Clarke, A. & de la Harpe. (2007). Working with conceptions of teaching to underpin lasting
Change in *Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship, Proceedings of the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference*, Adelaide, 8-11 July.
- Burns, R.B. (2000). *Introduction to research methods* (4 ed). French's Forest, NSW: Pearson Education Australia.
- Chapfika, B. (2008). The role of integrity in higher education. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, 4 (1) 43-49.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum Publishing Company.
- Fullan, M. (2001) *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Harland, T., & Staniforth, D. (2003). Academic Development as Academic Work. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8 (1/2), 25-35.
- Hicks, O. (1999). Integration of central and departmental development - reflections from Australian universities. *The International Journal for Academic*

Development 4(1), 43-51.

- Hudd, S. S., Apgar, C., Bronson E. F. & Lee, R. G. (2009) Creating a Campus Culture of Integrity: Comparing the Perspectives of Full- and Part-time Faculty. *The Journal of Higher Education*. 80(2) 146-177
- Kember, D., & Kwan, K. (2000). Lecturers' approaches to teaching and their relationship to conceptions of good teaching, *Instructional Science*, 28, 469-490.
- Kift, S. (2008). *First Year Curriculum Design: Articulating a Transition Pedagogy*. RMIT Roundtable. Melbourne.
- Krause, K. (2005). The changing student experience: Who's driving it and where is it going? *Keynote presented at the Student Experience Conference*, Charles Sturt University, NSW, 5-7 September 2005.
- Krause, K., Hartley, R., James, R., & McInnis, C. (2005). *The first year experience in Australian universities: Findings from a decade of national studies*. Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Land, R. (2001). Agency, context and change in academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(1), 4-20.
- Light, G. & Calkins, S. (2008). The Experience of Faculty Development: Patterns of Variation in Conceptions of Teaching. *International Journal of Academic Development*, 13 (1), 17-30.
- Macdonald, R. (2009). Academic Development. In Tight, M., Mok, K.H., Huisman, J., Morphew, C. (Eds.), *The Routledge International Higher Education Handbook*. Routledge, Hoboken.
- Manathunga, C. (2006). Doing Educational Development Ambivalently: Applying post-colonial metaphors to educational development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 11 (1), 19-29.
- Manathunga, C., & Peseta, T. (2007). The anxiety of making academics over: Resistance and responsibility in academic development. In Morely, I. (Ed). *The value of knowledge: At the interface*. Conference proceedings of 1st Global Conference on the value of knowledge, Sydney, Australia, 12-14 February, 2007.
- Marginson, S., & Considine, M. (2000). *The enterprise university: Power, governance and reinvention in Australia*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge & Melbourne.
- Ramsden, P. (2003) *Learning to teach in higher education*. RoutledgeFalmer
- Reid, A. (2002). Is there an 'ideal' approach for academic development. In Goody, A. & Ingram, D. (Ed.), *Spheres of influence: ventures and visions in educational development*. Organisational and Staff Development Services, The University of Western Australia, WA.
- Richardson, V. (1998). How teachers change. *Focus on Basics*, (2), C, Sept. NSCALL.

- Shulman, L., & Shulman, J. (2004). How and what teachers learn: a shifting perspective. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 36 (2), 257-271.
- Stephenson, J. & Yorke, M. (1998) *Capability and Quality in Higher Education* London: Kogan Page
- Tinto, V. (2002). Establishing Conditions for Student Success: Lessons Learned in the United States
in *Under-Privileged but Not Under-Achieving* (J. Astley, ed.), London: Trentham Books.
- Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1996). Changing approaches to teaching: A relational perspective. *Studies in Higher Education*, 21 (3), 275-284.
- Trowler, P. (2002). *Higher Education Policy and Institutional Change: Intentions and Outcomes in Turbulent Environments*. Taylor and Francis, USA.
- Volpe, R., Davidson, L. & Bell, C. (2008) Faculty Attitudes and Behaviours Concerning Student Cheating. *College Student Journal*, 42 (1), 164-175.
- Wellington, B. & Austin, P. (1996). Orientations to reflective practice. *Educational Research*, 38(3), 307-316.
- Wenger, E. (1999). *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Wingrove, D. & Alvarez, A. (2006) *Getting out there: the scholarship of community engagement and the reality of practice*. Paper presented at the AUCEA National Conference, Charles Darwin University, Alice Springs.