View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Queen Margaret University eResearch

IJAD-2011-0007

Evaluating learning and teaching: institutional needs and individual practices

Veronica Bamber and Sally Anderson

Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh

(Received 15 September 2010, final version received 11 March 2011)

Email: VBamber@qmu.ac.uk

Rather than a rational, technical activity, evaluation reflects the socio-political dynamics of the evaluative context. This presents a challenge for universities and the individuals within them, who may assume that plans or policies for evaluation will result in straightforward outcomes. This small-scale study in one institution looks at the tensions between institutional evaluative needs and individual evaluative practices. The results indicate that for staff in the institution, evaluative activity is largely autonomous and self-driven, rather than following institutional policy. A discretionary framework for the evaluation of learning and teaching was developed which may be a useful tool for educational developers in their analysis of evaluative practice.

Keywords: Evaluation, quality enhancement, quality assurance, policy, evaluative practices

Introduction

In the UK higher education sector, the back story to the evaluation of learning and teaching is the move from Quality Assurance (QA) to Quality Enhancement (QE). Demonstrating and evaluating quality became almost an industry itself in UK institutions following the rise of the Quality Assurance culture in the early 1990s (Ball, 1998), and the push towards accountability and managerialism which went hand in hand with QA were emblematic of what Kogan (2002, p.87) described as 'the shift in power from senior academics and their departments to the central institution and the dominance of systems over academic values'. QA's association with managerialism has linked it inexorably to top-down, management-driven activity, with consequent resistance from academic staff (Worthington & Hodgson, 2005; McInnis, 1995), and conflict between quality discourse and academic values (Kleiman, 2009; Cuthbert, 2011). The challenge for educational developers is to mediate between the institutional requirements for QA and academic norms, and this paper offers some suggestions for conceptual and practical tools for doing so.

The first section of the paper considers the literature on evaluation at both an institutional and an individual level. Then it reports on a survey of teaching staff in one particular university, shedding light on individual academic's experience of evaluation. In the analysis and discussion section, the compatibility and contradictions inherent in the two positions is discussed, and an analytical framework is developed to illustrate the impact of differences between the institutional and individual perspectives. The final section of the paper discusses the implications for educational developers of the results of the research.

QA/QE and the role of evaluation at institutional level

The story of evaluation in universities is the story of quality. It could be argued that the quality dynamic in universities has changed in the last decade, as the QA culture has shifted towards QE (Allan, 2009; Kleiman, 2009), with a 'virtuous circle of quality enhancement' (Sharp, 2009). This is especially so in the Scottish sector where the quality system is based on *Enhancement-Led* Institutional Review, within which institutions examine and monitor their own quality processes, and express this in a 'Reflective Analysis' (RA). The Quality Assurance Agency undertakes a cycle of quinquennial reviews to check the findings of institutional self-review.

QE, in theory at least, should be more acceptable to academics than QA: The Quality Assurance Agency (QAA, 2008: 13) define QE as 'taking deliberate steps to bring about improvement in the effectiveness of the learning experiences of students' – not an objectionable aim to most academics. However, QE does not come alone, even in enhancement-led review: the ELIR Handbook indicates that 'this powerful new focus on the enhancement of the student learning experience was not at the expense of the assurance of quality and the standards of awards' (QAA, 2008: 4).

The difficulties of implementing culture change from QA to QE within the HE sector are recognised in the external evaluation report of the Quality Enhancement Framework, which indicates 'Not surprisingly, we have found evidence of the persistence of behaviours redolent of the displaced quality assurance regime' (QAA, 2008: 6).

However, the report also found '[A] shift from the concealing behaviours associated with the previous quality assurance regimes operating in UK HE in the 1990s towards - and let it be clear that this is a direction of travel' (QAA, 2008: 6).

In spite of this 'direction of travel', and 'early evidence of the emergence of the green shoots of quality cultures' and 'the continuing development of reflective institutions (and faculties, schools and departments) on which quality cultures depend' (QAA, 2008: 8), QA and QE are still 'contested territories' (Filippakou & Tapper, 2008). And it is not clear that

QA-related QE has engendered 'learning architectures and enhancement cultures' (Trowler and Bamber, 2005: 90) to really enhance L&T.

Since enhancement includes assurance it is perhaps inevitable that institutional engagement with QA-related QE, and related evaluation, will still bear the marks of QA-related attitudes, behaviours and practices including 'cycles of planned phases including reflection, planning, implementation and evaluation' (QAA, 2008: 13). Institutions and their departments / faculties are expected to ask themselves, inter alia:

- Where are we now? (eg How effective is the current learning experience of our students? What evidence can we draw on? How robust is the evidence? What is the evidence telling us?)
- Where do we want to be in the future?
- How are we going to get there?
- How will we know when we get there? (eg What monitoring and evaluation processes do we have in place? How will the outcomes be analysed? How, and to whom, will the outcomes be disseminated? (QAA, 2008, p.13)

What this means from the perspective of evaluation is that institutions are required to obtain 'systematic awareness of the current learning experience of students' (QAA, 2008, p.16) through self-evaluation and reflection, as expressed in the institution's RA. The RA should be 'evaluative with specific references to supporting material or further reading' (QAA, 2008, p.38), and will:

> highlight the main and the distinctive features of the institution's arrangements for enhancing the student learning experience and securing academic standards. Crucially, the RA will set out the institution's reflections on the effectiveness of its approach in those areas, citing the evidence on which these reflections are based. (QAA, 2008, p.18)

The jury is still out on the extent to which enhancement-led review is fundamentally different from previous forms of quality evaluation. It is clear that institutional *self*-evaluation is central to current evaluative practices, and reflexivity is encouraged, but the real possibility of reflexivity when institutions are under inspection is not quite so certain. The public accountability purpose of institutional evaluation creates inevitable tensions between what Henkel (1998) calls the positivist and hermeneutic paradigms – the need for 'evidence' which will be publicly credible, versus reflection and subjective interpretation. If institutions are, indeed, responsible for their own quality standards, and publicly accountable (the outcomes of ELIR are public reports), then this sits uneasily alongside reflexivity. Institutional evaluation, therefore, is trying to fulfil a difficult dual role: to meet the *QA* requirements of public accountability, which involves demonstrating the *QE* activity of its staff. For QA, this involves evaluating the performance of the university as an organisation (Strathern, 2008, p.14), rather than the performance of individual academics. Unsurprisingly, this has not always been at the forefront of academics' concerns; they are increasingly exercised by the personal and group demands of delivering good educational experiences with decreasing resources amidst supercomplexity and possible 'epistemological pandemonium' (Barnett, 2000: 167). While the QAA may recognise the challenges for managing institutional evaluation in this context, and see that the behaviours of individual academics (Sharp, 2009) are key to supporting and evaluating student learning, the inevitable paper trail of QA-related evaluation (Strathern, 2008, p.14), and the attempt to 'measure the measurements' (ibid) falls to individual academics.

The Individual Perspective on Evaluation

Even in the current era of increased managerialism (Deem, 1998; Cuthbert, 2011), it is a truism that academic cultures are complex, pluralistic and contested (Barnett & Di Napoli, 2008; Middlehurst, 1995) – albeit to different extents and with different manifestations in different institutions (McNay, 1995). It is equally recognised that academic identities tend to be located within the disciplines (eg Harvey and Knight, 1996; Neumann et al, 2002), and that academic staff tend to be intrinsically motivated and enjoy teaching their courses (Harvey and Knight, 1996). For academic staff, effective, motivating evaluation should work with and within this complex context However, as we have seen, rather than working with the uncertainties and supercomplexity (Barnett, 2000; Lea & Callaghan, 2008) of academic practices, the managerialist roots of QA-related evaluation link it to targets, specification of outputs and performance measurement (Cuthbert, 2011).

In contrast, individual academics are involved in a continuing cycle of evaluative reflection on their teaching (Biggs, 1999), which may be difficult to quantify or record. In fact, Knight and Trowler (2001, p.19) tell us that professional practice is characterised by tacit knowing, which is unlikely to be amenable to rationalistic practices such as attempts at measurement. Lea & Callaghan (2008) give the example of lecturers interviewed at the University of Plymouth, who took a 'reflective approach to their role' (ibid, p.83):

> Being reflective for these participants represented more than a reaction to something; it included a full cycle of evaluating and reworking in the light of that evaluation. Such reflection was often in collaboration with other members of the teaching team and included the triangulation of data (student, lecturer, employers etc.).

While 'triangulation' sounds amenable to QA-type measurement, practices seemed looser – conducive to enhancement, but less so to assurance:

> one lecturer explained how he and his colleagues had redesigned a module using ''brainstorming'' to evaluate student need via group reflection in order to enhance the learning and teaching. (ibid)

The use of reflective practice as a key evaluative tool is not new in education; Schön (1991) and Eraut (2000) both highlighted the value of developing reflective processes for both organisations and the professionals within them, and most lecturer development programmes are underpinned by concepts of reflective practice (eg Gibbs & Coffey, 2000; Kahn et al, 2008). For lecturers who have participated in these programmes since they became contractual requirements in most UK universities (Bamber, 2002), evaluating their teaching through reflection is likely to be a familiar part of their learning and teaching practice.

However, modern university governance and policy pays little heed to individualised reflection. Academic staff can reflect and 'intuitively use experience-derived know-how to improve their practice' (Eraut, 1985, p.119), but this is insufficient for QA purposes, which requires a paper trail of evidence (Strathern, 2008). It would seem that there is potential disjunction between individual reflective practice and an institution's need for evidence.

In preparing for Institutional Review, the authors were interested to see to what extent individual evaluative practices reflected institutional policy on evaluation, given that policy implementation in universities does not follow a rational process, but is highly influenced by the interests of staff and others (Sporn, 1999).

Methodology

In order to obtain a realistic picture of the evaluative practices of academic staff, two educational developers issued an online survey in one small post-92 university with around 200 academic staff. The institution is teaching-led, with a narrow range of subject disciplines – health sciences, performing arts, social sciences and management.

An initial questionnaire of 13 questions was designed to elicit individuals' evaluation practices, and piloted with a sample of academic staff. The survey received university ethical approval, and respondents were assured of anonymity. The questionnaire included both quantitative and qualitative questions, asking respondents how they evaluate their learning and teaching, how they are evaluated by others, what has improved as a result, and how evaluation could be improved. Menus of multiple choice answers on types of evaluation method were drawn from the literature on evaluation (eg George & Cowan, 1999; Kember et al, 2002; Guba & Lincoln, 1992). Respondents were able to make multiple answers, for example as to which evaluation methods they used, and were able to add further methods under 'Other'.

A final version of the questionnaire was issued electronically via Bristol Online Surveys (BOS), and all staff with responsibility for facilitating student learning were invited to complete it. The survey was left open for 6 weeks, with circular reminder emails issued to all staff at two weekly intervals. The 50 responses received (approximately 25% of academic staff) were from a spread of subject disciplines. Quantitative data were generated automatically by BOS, and qualitative comments were categorised by themes - comments relating to self-evaluation; peer or team evaluation; management and administrative issues; and 'other'. 'Other' included a small number of comments relating to student issues (eg completion rates for questionnaires), constraints and resources, and procedural issues.

In addition, documentary analysis was undertaken on institutional documentation to ascertain formal policy and requirements for evaluation.

Results

Institutional policy evidence

Quality guidance in the institutional documentation indicates that:

> Module evaluation: Staff are required to conduct module evaluation every time a module is run. Standard forms are available which may be administered in paper format or via WebCT. A brief report on the outcomes of module evaluation should be considered either by the Programme Committee or a sub-group thereof. Issues and actions arising from module evaluation must be indicated in the annual programme monitoring report. (QMU, 2010, p.3)

Under the institution's Programme Management policy, there is clear responsibility for who will evaluate different levels of provision. Annual monitoring 'is designed to evaluate the continued effectiveness of taught provision' (QMU, 2009a, p.1); sources of feedback to inform this process include module evaluation forms, student–staff consultative committee meetings and programme committee meetings, external examiner reports and, where appropriate, employer feedback (ibid).

The University also has a Peer Observation of Teaching Policy, the purpose of which is 'to provide opportunities for individuals to reflect on their own teaching and professional development and to stimulate discussion about improving student learning' (QMU, 2009b, p.1). It is expected that all members of academic staff, 'including the very experienced and the less experienced, will observe at least once and will be observed at least once in every

academic year' (QMU, 2009b, p.1). Staff are asked to send their Record of Observation to the Dean of School.

Questionnaire evidence

The responses to the question: '*How do you evaluate your work?*' are shown in Figure 1 below and, in contrast to the rather limited range of evaluative mechanisms mentioned in the institutional document survey, reveal the range of activities used by staff to evaluate their work.

FIGURE 1 HERE

When asked '*What could improve the way that you evaluate your learning and teaching practice?'* some respondents were not entirely satisfied with their relative autonomy. While a number of staff wanted more team (6) or self-driven approaches (6), there was also a call for more systemic support, for centrally-organised evaluation and enhancement activities such as Peer Observation (5) or Mentoring (3). Nonetheless, while many staff wished for 'more regular and structured processes of evaluation', they did not want bureaucratic systems, but 'a more creative approach as well as the standard approaches', and encouragement not to be so 'set in my ways'.

The next question asked: '*How are you evaluated? In other words, how do your department, institution, line manager or others get information about how your learning and teaching is going?'* A number of respondents mentioned specific mechanisms, such as:

- Informal student comment (11)
- Informal peer feedback (11)
- Module evaluations (10)
- Student Staff Committees (8)
- Appraisal (8)
- Review within team (6)
- Assessment results (4) and performance (3).

Others felt that their line managers did not receive information about their learning and teaching activity:

> I don't honestly feel that I am specifically evaluated. I think people would only notice something 'going wrong' if a large number of students either failed summative assignments or complained via Personal Tutors.

Analysis and discussion

As can be readily identified from this brief summary of the results, respondents acknowledged the desirability of evaluation, but with appropriate support from the institution or school, particularly a 'commitment to actually doing something' with evaluation data.

There were suggestions for improvement – usually within the norms of respondents' own teaching - via (more) learning with and from peers; team teaching; required (as opposed to voluntary, ad hoc) peer review / observation; and some structural support from, for example, educational development. While there was interest in improving evaluation, it was with the caveat that this should not involve significant time or effort:

> If it were to involve any more paperwork I would jump off a cliff. There must be a distinction made between accountability and persecution. I would like something supportive and creative.

As indicated in the results section, individual evaluation has two strands: the evaluation of individuals by themselves, and their evaluation by others. When asked about their evaluation in both areas, survey respondents tended to indicate that evaluation in either form was to be welcomed. The respondents expressed no real resistance to evaluating their work:

> I think it is crucial to constantly evaluate your input with students. Evaluation is a great learning opportunity.

or to being evaluated:

> Lecturers tend to be lone workers in their own environment; if they were to receive feedback from an observer and/or receive regular feedback from students that had to be acted upon they may appreciate more just how many bad practices they have picked up. Evaluation and reflection on what we do is the only way we will ever progress ourselves and our students.

This corroborates the finding of Worthington & Hodgson's (2005) study, that academics do not object to being held to account for their performance. What the academics they interviewed did object to was the displacement of traditional self-regulatory forms of professional accountability, with a culture of institutionalised distrust (ibid, p.99). While this 'institutionalised distrust' did not emerge as an issue in the current survey, what was apparent was lack of alignment with institutional policies. For instance, when asked *'How do you evaluate your learning and teaching activity? In other words, how do you decide whether or not it is going well and students are learning what you want them to learn?'*, it was clear that, while some staff use university systems (such as the university module questionnaire), evaluation is an autonomous activity for many staff:

> I change what I do constantly. It's an organic process, although I'm not clear myself how much external feedback informs that process. I think it's mainly my own judgement.

In summary, the respondents seemed intrinsically motivated to evaluate and improve their practice, and could see the value of doing so, and there was a large amount and range of evaluative activity going on.

Based on the themes identified in the literature relating to the tension between quality assurance and quality enhancement, and the tension between institutional policy and individual practice, a conceptual framework was developed onto which data were plotted to help make connections between what respondents were saying about evaluation, and how this related to their political and social context. Since what is being mapped is the level of discretion which academics have in evaluating their work, the term 'discretion framework' was adopted. The vertical axis plots the line between adherence to institutional policy of the evaluative method used, and individual practice. The horizontal axis plots whether the evaluative method is QA-oriented or QE-oriented.

The authors do not claim that plotting the survey results onto the discretion framework is 'scientific'. What is depicted is our interpretation of the purpose of the evaluations done by academic staff. We are using the discretion framework as a heuristic

device to help us see things differently. The aim is to take a fresh look at institutional policy-making about evaluation, individual responses to such policies, and what all of this means for us as educational developers.

Figure 2 uses the discretion framework to provide an alternative view of the responses given to the question of how staff evaluated their own work.

FIGURE 2 HERE

It is immediately obvious that most evaluation is going on in the bottom right-hand corner of the diagram; this means that academic staff largely decide for themselves what they evaluate, and how they go about evaluating it, and use the information they receive for reflective purposes, rather than necessarily converting it into a format that facilitates QA reporting. However, responses suggest that institutional and individual intentions do not necessarily need to be in conflict. In fact, a number of respondents suggested that, in order for them to learn more about their practice, individual reflexivity was not sufficient and greater systemic support was required. There seemed to be a wish to combine the positive aspects of individual QE with some of the structures and requirements associated with QA.

For educational development purposes, the discretion framework can also be used to examine how evaluation operates for specific levels and types of evaluation: for example, at the institutional level of quality audit; at the subject level of programme evaluation; or at the individual level of module evaluation.

As an example, in Figure 3, module evaluation is mapped on to the framework.

FIGURE 3 HERE

In this diagram, the diagonal lines depict the pull between different political and cultural tensions. If individuals evaluate their practice because they are self-motivated and wish to improve what their students experience, this powerful driver from the bottom right-hand corner of the diagram might be weakened or lost by a strong pull from the top left-hand corner. If institutions want their staff to be reflexive, this might be lost in the need for institutional 'data' required for QA purposes. For educational developers, this could be an opportunity rather than a threat, if institutions can be persuaded to value and work creatively with programme teams' and academics' own data.

Returning to the case of module evaluation as depicted in Figure 3, many universities provide a 'standard' questionnaire which academic staff are expected to use to evaluate their modules. This sits in the top left-hand quadrant. However, the questionnaire is often unpopular for a number of reasons: staff do not like standardised questionnaires, as they don't ask quite the right questions in quite the right way for their practices, and are seen as a management instrument. If institutional questionnaires are put on-line, everyone forgets they are there. Students are resistant to filling in questionnaires, returns are low, and so data are incomplete. Pressure on staff time means that scant attention may be paid to analysing the responses, so the whole exercise risks falling into disuse. In the survey, 15 respondents indicated that they were using 'the' university questionnaire; this means that another 35, the majority, were not.

In contrast, the range of module evaluation taking place in Figure 2 – largely in the 'bottom-up' corner of the framework – indicates that these 50 people were indeed evaluating their modules, but not necessarily following university policy.

The evaluation examples summarised above raise a number of questions regarding the compatibility or tensions between evaluative purposes and practices at the institutional and individual levels. Having started this paper asking whether there are tensions between

institutional evaluative needs and individual evaluative practices, the survey responses have confirmed this point: individuals wish to evaluate their learning and teaching, and institutions need to demonstrate the value of their work, but the two activities may not be aligned. Academics' intrinsic desire to do their teaching well and to demonstrate that they are doing so may be untapped in processes that overlook academic cultures and values.

The final question, then, is how to reconcile these differences: institutions cannot stop evaluating for quality purposes, and individuals will not all take on the mantle of quality assessment. Bailey (1977, p.11) offers some help, when he reminds us that contradictory values and trade-offs between them can be accommodated in an 'adaptive system', where values find 'adjustment in the world of experience'. Pragmatic trade-offs which bring people out from behind their 'principled stockades' (ibid, p.10) are required. The way to do this is what Filippakou & Tapper (2008, p.92) call 'a flexible, negotiated evaluative model' which recognises different interests.

Conclusions

Evaluation is complex and problematic. There is no easy solution to obtaining good data about learning and teaching – no matter what the apparently clear and rational expectations of external QA and institutional policy might suggest. It may be that, given the different purposes and uses of evaluation, and the different audiences an evaluation might be aimed at, there is a case for separating out evaluation for assurance and evaluation for enhancement. The two will have some common ground, but the latter is much more likely to engage academics in action. Evaluation which is rooted in academic *practices* within the specific discipline may be difficult to quantify, but it is just this type of evaluation which will lead to enhancement. Evaluation which is focused on institutional performativity, on the other hand, may, at best, obtain little more than superficial compliance. At worst, it will simply be ignored.

The survey responses from academics in one institution are testimony to their commitment to evaluating and enhancing their practice, although their evaluative practices may have only a nodding acquaintance with institutional policies on evaluation. The challenge for educational developers is how to tap this intrinsic, enhancement-led commitment of academic staff. A first step is to work with the tensions between top-down policy and bottom-up practices. It would be naive and unrealistic to suggest that all evaluative practices can, or should, fit into the bottom right hand quadrant of the discretion framework, but these practices are located within academic and subject discipline cultures and are, therefore, more likely to happen, and be taken seriously. If institutional evaluation can tap some of these qualitative mechanisms then the chance of resistance is lower, and the possibilities for two-way reflexivity higher. Individual academics might also feel that they are receiving something 'creative and supportive' rather than a managerially-driven demand for numeric data.

Doing this would entail honest dialogue between management and academics. Frank discussion of evaluation options with departments and their staff, with sensitivity to cultural norms and workload priorities, might be an improvement on what otherwise might be bare compliance with institutional policy.

Whatever is done in the name of evaluation, evaluative practices clearly need to be efficient, in a hard-pushed HE sector with limited resources. Particular evaluative practices could be adapted for different purposes, providing QE data for staff and programme teams who want to improve their practice, and QA for the institution/department. This has implications for how institutions frame their policies. It means clear messages from the top and operational flexibility on the ground. Since it is unlikely that the same evaluative methods will work for or be accepted by all subject groups, given the range of learning and

teaching practices and philosophies in different groups, realistic flexibility as to *how* evaluation is carried out is vital. Most crucially, institutions and staff need to be encouraged to have the confidence to confront and question assumptions and statements about the uniformity of standard approaches to evaluation. In the institution where this study was carried out, for instance, the main learning and teaching committee has discussed the findings of the study, and have accepted educational development's proposal of encouraging programme teams to collect their own evaluative data in their own way, as long as they analyse these data formally for QA purposes. This challenges the assumption of policy statements which are predicated on standard, university-wide approaches to evaluation, and challenges university managers to 'develop alternative narratives' (Cuthbert, 2011) for evaluation, which 'transcend managerial pressures' whilst acknowledging core academic values and 'the more qualitative commitment of many staff, motivated by higher ideals than ticking boxes in the corporate strategy' (ibid). For educational developers reading this paper, the challenge is, again, to confront policy rhetoric and ask ourselves some hard questions, such as:

- Would a survey of evaluative practices in our institution reveal similar dichotomies between evaluation policy and practice?
- How do we work to reconceptualise evaluation as an activity which is rooted in academic practices, not a separate technical activity?
- How do we broker the gap between evaluation policy requirements and individual / disciplinary practices?
- How do we broach uncomfortable truths with managers or committees who may occasionally overlook the gap between evaluation policy and practice?

This is normal terrain for educational development, but until carrying out the survey which provided the empirical data for this paper, the developers in our own institution had not asked these questions with regard to evaluation. While a small-scale survey may not radically change our approach to evaluation, it has made us take a fresh look at our evaluative practices, through the discretion framework lens.

Notes on contributors

Roni Bamber is Director of the Centre for Academic Practice at Queen Margaret University, Edinburgh. She has worked as an educational developer for twelve years, and has participated in numerous national initiatives, particularly the Scottish Enhancement Themes. Her current research is in the implementation and evaluation of staff development programmes, and introducing change in universities.

Sally Anderson is an education consultant working with Queen Margaret University's Centre for Academic Practice as project officer for the 21st Century Graduate Enhancement Theme. She has worked for over 20 years in the area of distance learning, primarily in management, programme design and materials development, but also as an online tutor. More recently, she has been involved in working with tertiary education institutions on institutional learning and teaching strategy and strategic change initiatives.

References

Allan, C. (2009). Changing the rules of engagement: down the disciplinary road. In Bamber, V., Trowler, P., Saunders, M., & Knight, P. *Enhancing learning, teaching, assessment*

and curriculum in higher education: Theory, cases, practices. (pp. -). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bailey, F. G. (1977). *Morality and expediency: The folklore of academic politics*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Ball, S. J. (1998). Big policies / small world: An introduction to international perspectives in education policy. *Comparative Education*, *34*(2), 119-130.

Bamber, V. (2002). To what extent has the Dearing policy recommendation on training new lecturers met acceptance? Where Dearing went that Robbins didn't dare. *Teacher Development*. *6*(3), 433-457.

Barnett, R. (2000). *Realising the university in an age of supercomplexity*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University.

Barnett, R. & Di Napoli, R. (2008). *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives.* London: Routledge.

Biggs, J. B. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Clark, B. R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national perspective.* Berkley: University of California Press.

Cowan, J. & George, J. (1997). *Formative evaluation, bordering on action research.* Open University in Scotland, Report 97/5.

Cuthbert, R. (2011). Failing the challenge of institutional evaluation: how and why managerialism flourishes. In M. Saunders, P. Trowler, & V. Bamber, V. (Eds.) *Reconceptualising evaluation in higher education: The practice turn.* (pp. -). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Deem, R. (1998). 'New managerialism' and higher education: The management of performances and cultures in universities in the United Kingdom. *International Studies in Sociology of Education, 8*(1), 47-70.

Eraut, M. (1985). Knowledge creation and knowledge use in professional contexts. *Studies in Higher Education*, *10*(2), 117-133.

Eraut, M. (2000). Non-formal learning and tacit knowledge in professional work. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *70*, 113-136.

Filippakou, O. & Tapper, T. (2008). Quality assurance and quality enhancement in higher education: Contested territories? *Higher Education Quarterly*, *62*(1-2), 84-100.

George, J.W. & Cowan, J. (1999). *A handbook of techniques for formative evaluation.* London: Kogan Page.

Gibbs, G. & Coffey, M. (2000). Training to teach in higher education: a research agenda. *Teacher Development*, *4*(20), 31-44.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1992) *Effective evaluation: Improving the usefulness of evaluation results through responsive and naturalistic approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Harvey, L. & Knight, P. T. (1996). *Transforming higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Henkel, M. (1998) Evaluation in higher education: Conceptual and epistemological foundations. *European Journal of Education*, *33*(3), 285-297.

Kahn, P., Young, R., Grace, S., Pilkington, R., Rush, L., Tomkinson, B., & Willis, I. (2008). Theory and legitimacy in professional education: a practitioner review of reflective processes within programmes for new academic staff. *International Journal for Academic Development 13*(3), 161-173.

Kember, D., Leung, D.Y.P. & Kwan, K.P. (2002). Does the use of student feedback questionnaires improve the overall quality of teaching? *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education 27*(5), 411-425.

Kleiman, P. (2009). Talking the talk, walking the walk: the work of an LTSN subject centre. In Bamber, V., Trowler, P., Saunders, M., and Knight, P. *Enhancing Learning, Teaching, Assessment and Curriculum in Higher Education: Theory, Cases, Practices* (pp. -). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Knight, P. & Trowler, P. (2001). *Departmental leadership in higher education*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Kogan, M. (2002). The role of different groups in policy-making and implementation: institutional politics and policy-making. In: Trowler, P. (Ed) *Higher education policy and institutional change: Intentions and outcomes in turbulent environments* (pp. 46 - 63). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Lea, S.J. & Callaghan, L. (2008). Lecturers on teaching within the 'supercomplexity' of Higher Education. Higher Education, 55:171–187.

McInnis, C. (1995). Less Control and More Vocationalism: The Australian and New Zealand Experience. In Schuller, T., (Ed) *The changing university?* (pp. 38-51). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

McNay, I. (1995). From the Collegial Academy to Corporate Enterprise: The Changing Cultures of Universities. In Schuller, T. (Ed) *The changing university?* (pp. 105-115). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Middlehurst, R. (1995). Changing leadership in universities. In Schuller, T, (Ed) *The Changing University?* (pp. -). Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Neumann, R., Parry, S., & Becher, T. (2002). Teaching and learning in their disciplinary contexts: a conceptual analysis. *Studies in Higher Education*. 27(4), pp. 405–417

QAA (2008). Enhancement-led institutional review handbook: Scotland. (2nd edition) QAA 247 06/08. Retrieved January 7, 2011 from http://www.qaa.ac.uk/reviews/ELIR/handbook08final/ELIRHandbook2008.pdf

QMU (2009a). *Annual monitoring guidance notes.* Retrieved January 7, 2011 from http://www.qmu.ac.uk/quality/fm/others.htm

QMU (2009b). *Sharing excellence in teaching: Peer observation*. Retrieved January 7, 2011 from http://www.qmu.ac.uk/quality/qe/default.htm

QMU (2010). *Summary of quality assurance and quality enhancement procedures for taught programmes*. Retrieved January 7, 2011 from http://www.qmu.ac.uk/quality/qa/overview.htm

Schön, D. (1991). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.

Sharp, N. (2009). *Quality* assurance for enhancement (keynote presentation). *International network for quality assurance agencies in higher education* (INQAAHE) conference 2009. QAA Retrieved September 9, 2011 from http://www.qaa.ac.uk/news/speeches/NS310309.asp

Sporn, B. (1999). *Adaptive university structures: An analysis of adaptation to socioeconomic environments of US and European universities*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers

Strathern, M. (2008). Knowledge identities. In Barnett, R. And Di Napoli, R. *Changing identities in higher education: Voicing perspectives.* (pp. -). London: Routledge.

Trowler, P. & Bamber, V. (2005) Compulsory higher education teacher education: joined-up policies; institutional architectures; enhancement cultures. *International Journal for Academic Development*, *10*(2), 79-93.

Trowler, P. (Ed) (2002). *Higher education policy and institutional change: Intentions and outcomes in turbulent environments*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Worthington, F. & Hodgson, J. (2005). Academic labour and the politics of quality in higher education: a critical evaluation of the conditions of possibility of resistance. *Critical Quarterly, 47* (1-2), 97-110.