Northumbria Research Link

UniversityLibrary

Peter Holgate, Kay Sambell*
Northumbria University, *Edinburgh Napier University

Abstract
The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) offers a bottom-up, locally situated and contextualized approach to enhancing educational practice. It has been championed for several years, yet remains curiously undervalued within the academy, despite clear benefits for curricular development and staff engagement. This paper reflects upon the production of an auto-ethnographic reflective evaluation of SoTL activities relating to architectural education, forming part of the first author's portfolio-based assessment for a Professional Doctorate in Education (Ed D). The paper evaluates the challenges and potential of undertaking this doctoral assessment path, which appears to be seldom employed, at least in the UK. Particular attention is placed on negotiated assessment by portfolio as a key driver for practical value, and the flexibility that this route affords for academics to shape their professional development through SoTL activities. Affordances and challenges of this pathway for practitioner-led scholarship and doctoral recognition are illuminated.

Keywords
Portfolio assessment; doctoral assessment; scholarship of teaching and learning; professional doctorate, pragmatism.

Introduction
This paper presents a case study of undertaking a professional doctorate in education by portfolio in a modern UK university. It aims to illustrate some affordances and challenges that the candidate, as a teaching-focused practitioner in a Department of Architecture, encountered in negotiating this assessment route as a valid approach to demonstrating advanced scholarship within his learning and teaching related practices. Charting this approach to compiling and structuring the portfolio, particularly in the development of an auto-ethnographic evaluation of his varied Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) practices, the author draws upon a Pragmatist framework to champion the portfolio route as a valid vehicle for doctoral recognition of advanced scholarship that is authentically embedded in the inquiries of the teaching-focused academic.

The reflective evaluation we offer here, while highly localized, relevant and context-specific, is valuable given the ways in which practitioners' SoTL activities are often misunderstood, marginalized or under-valued (Tierney, 2019). Similarly, there are few exemplars that acknowledge SoTL's value in developing a doctoral pathway (Muldoon, 2010). Taking such 'roads less-travelled' often means choosing a journey into unknown territory, for candidate and supervisor alike; this paper seeks to offer practical insights towards assisting potential candidates or supervisors to envisage their own or others' SoTL activities as steps in a doctoral journey, through real-life exemplification of the portfolio approach. While the versatility of this assessment format is a key strength, it also presents tangible uncertainties and challenges; these include

Citation
Holgate P., Sambell, K. (2020) 'The professional doctorate by portfolio: alternative assessment for advanced practitioner-led scholarship?', *Practitioner Research in Higher Education Journal*, 13(1), pp. 57-69.

selection of suitable components, approaches to structuring the accompanying commentary, and ultimately embodying assessment *for, as* and *of* doctoral-level quality and professionally-relevant learning within the submission. It requires an openness to new and original possibilities, and a negotiated assessment methodology which can be disconcertingly unfamiliar to candidates, supervisors and examiners alike.

Background context

Increasingly diverse approaches to assessing and providing doctoral education have emerged in the last few decades. In particular, professional doctorates have proliferated in several nations (Lea, Brennan and Green, 2009), being introduced to strengthen the relevance of doctoral-level work to professionals' particular ways of thinking and practicing (Entwistle, 2009), thereby aiming to embed doctoral enquiry towards purposefully equipping candidates for future, critical professional practice. This approach contrasts with hitherto default assumptions of PhDs prioritizing the preparation of candidates to pursue research careers in the academy.

In a study exploring doctoral differences between these alternative routes in one institution, Neumann (2005) however discerned that the actual experience of undertaking a professional doctorate proved to be far less distinctive from the traditional route than might have been anticipated. This study illuminated that often candidates initially chose the professional doctorate format in the belief that it would be more accessible, potentially enabling them to conduct research of direct relevance to their workplace. In execution, the nature, scope and outputs of the realized research projects did not manifest themselves as substantially different in format, methods or outputs from 'traditional' PhDs produced by fellow candidates from the institution. Indeed, most professional doctorate candidates and supervisors in the study opined that the chosen research topics, outputs and formats could equally have been comfortably accommodated within the traditional doctorate route. Major differences between the two routes chiefly appeared to reside in the target populations for candidates and the selection criteria for admission. Most notably for our current paper, Neumann observed that within the professional doctorate route, as with the PhD, *'the success of a student's doctorate rested on the research thesis'* (p 182). In other words, in terms of the final assessment process, there appeared to be little substantial evidence of variance in the assessment practices embodied by the two routes.

In similar fashion, the PhD by Publication has provided another alternative doctoral route. PhDs by published works may be viewed as being focused upon an academic career within the university, reflecting the increasing importance being placed by many universities on publications and outputs for all academics, not simply the few. In the authors' own experiences, this route appears to be proving attractive to academics who have a long-track record of completed journal and conference papers, enabling retrospective doctoral recognition for their outputs. Such alternatives appear particularly attractive to practitioners who specialize in facilitating student learning, but who may have originally entered the academy from professional backgrounds (such as Teaching, Law, Nursing, Architecture etc.) where doctoral study would not be routinely expected as a prerequisite for professional practice. In short, the PhD by Publication provides a means for teaching-focused practitioners in higher education, typically working in a disciplinary context, to claim reward and recognition for important and original contributions they have been making to the scholarship of learning and teaching within their fields.

While there is much to recommend this assessment format (Maxwell, 2013; Smith, 2015), the PhD by publication route arguably continues to follow a relatively traditional process, affording less latitude for more radical departures from normative academic outputs of monographs, peer-reviewed papers etc., and thereby addressing academic prerequisites in preference to professional communities of practice

(Muldoon, 2010). While the 'by Publication' route can provide a valuable method of doctoral recognition for some teaching-focused practitioners (particularly for candidates whose disciplinary backgrounds and contexts demand such academically-oriented peer-reviewed research outputs), this format may hold risks and challenges for those teaching-focused practitioners who operate outside these boundaries, whether by choice or through circumstances.

As a 'third way' towards doctoral qualification, this paper specifically reflects upon, and evaluates the affordances and challenges of doctoral assessment by portfolio (Maxwell, 2003), from the perspective of a candidate who purposefully chose this route. It outlines the ways in which portfolio assessment offered a creative and expansive way of achieving doctoral recognition for creatively conducted, pragmatically positioned and diversely disseminated contributions to knowledge. It evaluates the candidate's experience of the challenges and benefits of the doctoral-level portfolio as an appropriate alternative that can embrace practitioner-based activities undertaken within the 'big tent' auspices of SoTL.

The challenges of recognizing SoTL quality
Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) activities, that focus upon professional knowledge production resulting from learning and teaching inquiries, require serious systematic reflection in order to become public knowledge within the academy (Trigwell, 2013; Huber & Hutchings, 2005). However, such important interventions do not necessarily lead to formal publication, and the knowledge produced is not necessarily confined to a disciplinary specialists. For the authors of this paper, the so-called 'Big Tent' conceptualization (Hutchings, 2000; Chick, 2014) is arguably poorly represented via normative PhD routes in terms of accommodating and theorizing the immense breadth and potential that SoTL encompasses. A core premise of the 'Big Tent' metaphor is the considerable space and creativity within the SoTL arena for diverse ways of doing things: the freedom and acceptance of individuals wishing to pursue SoTL to explore, establish *'what works'* in their arena, and to apply practically useful knowledge. Importantly, SoTL's principles seeks to challenge assumed models of 'scholarship' and its academically-prescribed practices, insofar as the 'education-focused' doctorate is typically construed within UK academia.

In championing diversity, this paper does not question the value of the default model for many candidates; it simply seeks to present another doctoral research journey which similarly sought validity, rigour, and the satisfaction of external examiners that appropriate levels of scholarship had been achieved. Concurrently, this advanced scholarship was deeply embedded in principles of practical utility and inextricably linked to the everyday practices of an academic who had chosen to prioritize teaching and learning over other pathways within the academy.

Candidate's reflections: why i chose the portfolio assessment route
I was attracted to the path for multiple reasons. Firstly, as an architect, the production of a portfolio is familiarly understood as a curated assembly of diverse outputs, including process and finished works, through a variety of methods of media and communications, towards a holistic and comprehensive demonstration of creativity, synthesis, knowledge and skills. The portfolio remains a key vehicle for assessment in architectural education and practice alike, as well as wider arts and design subjects. Hence, the doctorate by portfolio format is not uncommon in creative disciplines, whereby candidates present outputs, such as paintings, designs, artefacts, installations etc. to showcase a comprehensive fusion of knowledge, imagination and skills (Maxwell, 2003). These submissions are typically supported by a synthesizing narrative that argues a claim for doctoral quality through originality, contribution and coherence.

In parallel, the metaphor of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning as a 'Big Tent' resonated strongly

with my own disciplinary practice and personal values. The 'Big Tent' provided rich allusions spanning educational and architectural fields; 'shelter', 'structure', 'performance', 'transience', 'variety', even 'circus', are all terms that could reflect aspects of my practice (Huber & Hutchings, 2005, p.30; Chick, 2014). Influenced by Boyer's broad conceptualization of 'Scholarship Reconsidered', that intertwined the activities of teaching, research and service as a partnership underpinning successful models of higher education (Boyer, 1990), the SoTL movement champions diversity in approaches to educational research, with the 'Big Tent' metaphor acknowledging the breadth of relevant tools, scales, methodologies, and vehicles applicable for the design and dissemination of pedagogical inquiries to relevant audiences. The SoTL movement seeks to maintain an active and transformational *'conversation' regarding scholarship, teaching and learning'* (Rorty, 1988, p. 378, in Reason, 2015, p.5) in order to build and develop the *'teaching commons'* (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). Whilst SoTL consistently resists singular definitions, key aspects of the movement underpin its international appeal, not least in the 'bottom-up' nature of its activities whereby educators themselves take the initiative in improving the learning journey of students by identifying and researching discrete and appropriate areas for improvement. Such approaches contrast with 'top-down' imposed strategies from institutional managers that may ignore the specialisms, nuances and contexts of disciplinary practices (Shulman, 2005; Entwistle, 2009).

In its ethos, SoTL embodies a spirit of collegiality, diversity and conversation, with the 'Big Tent' metaphor being complemented by the concept of the 'learning commons' (Huber & Hutchings, 2005). Here, the outcomes of educational inquiry are presented in an 'appropriately public' domain (Felten, 2013), for wider social benefit and application. In this respect, SoTL aligns with Pragmatist philosophies in terms of social benefit commensurate with practical approaches to solving, or dissolving apparent problems. However, despite the movement's good intentions, SoTL's impact and reputation in many higher education institutions remains undervalued (Boshier, 2009). Curricular initiatives, often initiated by staff working with limited resources of time, academic space or institutional support, may consequently result in emergent, novel and pragmatic approaches to inquiry that do not always follow normative expectations of 'rigorous' research. Nevertheless, prioritising an unreflective culture of quality assurance over creative and original approaches to enhancement risks dissuading academics from sincere efforts to improve the student learning experience. A key challenge to SoTL therefore arises in mutual recognition of 'value' for such initiatives, as validated by students, staff and institutional bodies (Trigwell, 2013).

By contrast to engagement with SoTL, modern Universities increasingly value the development and recruitment of academically-credentialed staff, being keen to boost numbers of their doctorally-qualified academics (Shin et al., 2018). Promotion and tenure may be linked to teachers' successful completion of doctorates, with qualified staff subsequently directed to supervise rising numbers of postgraduate students. However, the completion of a 'normative' PhD, while concurrently delivering the learning and service elements of an academic role, can remain a challenging prospect for teaching-focused academics. Professional Doctorate routes may provide alternative vehicles for academic progression, often enabling sufficient flexibility to maintain a primary commitment to teaching and learning activities while concurrently pursuing associated research initiatives. Imaginative approaches to professional doctorates can support purposive, contextually-based inquiry approaches of *'knowledge for'* in preference to *'knowledge of'*, as illustrated in Table 1 (see also Maxwell & Kupczyk-Romanczuk, 2009, p. 11; Muldoon, 2010, p.36).

Table 1. Comparison of Professional Doctorate and Traditional PhD (adapted from Gale, 2008).

Traditional PhD	Professional Doctorate
Pre-service	In service
Theoretical research	Applied research
Single discipline	transdisciplinary
Theoretical knowledge	Knowledge in context
'knowledge of…'	'knowledge for…'
Development of research career	Development of academic career
Literature / laboratory based research	Work based action research

Purpose, flexibility and deliverability were key factors in my choice of the Professional Doctorate by Portfolio over alternative awards. Having a key leadership role within the Architectural Programme Team at Northumbria University, I discounted doctoral study that would be thematically disconnected from my professional context and practice on multiple grounds. These included the responsibilities and constraints of delivering a full-time academic portfolio of teaching, service and research, as well as the need to respond to contingencies of professional body and institutional demands. Chiefly, my pedagogical creed prioritised the continuing improvement of the student experience over the individualist production of an independent research inquiry. Furthermore, the doctoral route *'by portfolio'* offered me the scope, range and flexibility to address authentic issues of complexity and trans-disciplinary collaboration relevant to academic practice that could be contrasted with more narrowly-focused 'default' methodologies of inquiry that inadequately reflect the rich context and range contained within the 'Big Tent' of SoTL. The following account describes the way I constructed my Professional Doctorate portfolio to capitalise upon SoTL's ethos, inclusivity and aims.

My Professional Doctorate: A Portfolio of Reflective Practice
The curation, analysis and synthesis of a portfolio of small-scale educational initiatives formed the basis of my Professional Doctorate in Education (Holgate, 2016). These elements were accompanied by a critical commentary that centred upon my development of a 'curriculum for engagement.' This theme provided a means to synthesize educational theory and policy through my personal reflection of developing the courses of architecture at Northumbria University from 2005 to 2015. This portfolio of evidence drew upon my broad interpretation of relevant SoTL activities and other initiatives, illustrating contextualised examples of how the architecture curriculum had been progressively developed and practically implemented, via appropriate responses to opportunities for continual improvement of the student learning experience. I valued the flexibility of this doctoral assessment through its utility in reflecting the complexities and contingencies associated with my role. *'By Portfolio'* was selected in preference to the *'by Publication'* route in order to accurately reflect my variety of practices; critically, the latter approach can be heavily reliant upon timely publication of journal papers for ultimate completion (Badley, 2009, p.333; Robins & Kanowski, 2008, p. 10). By contrast, the *'by Portfolio'* route maximised my control in shaping the study programme as it progressed, with flexibility to draw upon a wide-ranging selection of portfolio components.

The selection of portfolio components
From a wider collection of activities related to my first decade in Higher Education, I critically evaluated and selected ten portfolio components related to the theme of student engagement to represent the

range and focus of my initiatives and inquiries. These included:

1. the collaborative drafting of institutional policy on assessment practice (derived from a comprehensive literature review and focus group activities)
2. a position paper on the development of a learning commons for architectural education (applying the theories of SoTL to this particular discipline)
3. production of a website exploring creative architectural design processes (arising from an autoethnographic study of digital design methods, conducted with a Masters student)
4. a paper on women's experiences of architectural education (derived from semi-structured interviews with female students and staff)
5. a book chapter regarding the regional engagement activities of the courses of architecture at Northumbria University (drawing upon evaluation of several case studies)
6. a cross-institutional, peer-reviewed international conference paper reporting upon the development of an architectural design competition as a research methodology in wayfinding
7. a paper for the Higher Education Academy regarding the pacing of the architecture syllabus to effect best learning
8. an inquiry into student time-management in the architecture courses at NU (using quantitative and qualitative student self-reporting to elicit data)
9. another conference paper about embedding academic literacies into the first year curriculum (co-authored with students and developed through focus group discussions)

The majority of these portfolio components were collaborative works, produced in conjunction with a wide range of students and academics (from the department, the institution and external HEIs). My selection sought to reflect authentically the practical, iterative, hierarchical and collegial nature of curricular design, responding to issues arising in the development of these courses of architecture. All outputs were peer reviewed at levels appropriate to their methods of dissemination. Additionally one academic journal paper, concerning the experiences of students with dyslexia in architectural education, was included (Holgate, 2015). I had sole responsibility for this article's production; despite the fact that collaborative works more accurately represented my practice, this paper sought to provide prospective examiners with assurance that I could operate independently at rigorous levels of academic practice. However, in contrast with the submission of peer-reviewed journal papers for the *'by publication'* award, I was keen to establish doctoral-level quality chiefly through contextual application, the synthetic integration of theory and practice, and originality in process as well as content. Several of my portfolio components were initiated, or completed, within a five year period in advance of completing this doctoral programme, and were deeply imbued within my academic practice.

Creating the critical commentary
My accompanying commentary contextualised these outputs within a wider theoretical framework of curricular design, which aimed to inform the direction of our architecture programmes. A Pragmatist worldview emerged as an applicable paradigm for my embedded and diverse activities. This approach is presented as a potential starting point for the theorisation and framing of academics' SoTL activities as part of doctoral inquiry by portfolio

The Pragmatist paradigm offered me the opportunity to acknowledge 'contingency'. This was essential for writing up, as I was presenting a time-bounded reflection of an iterative process in seeking to establish a model of the curriculum as a dynamic and fluid concept. Consequently, I chose to eschew the 'critical incident' narrative approach employed in many Professional Doctorates (Gibbs, 1988; Johns, 2000) that commence from a contextualised 'deficiency' or 'failure' as a basis for inquiry and resolution. Although

significant episodes, events and incidents have inevitably occurred during the development of the architectural programmes at Northumbria, the goal of continued improvement has commenced from a pragmatic interrogation of *'what works'* (Hutchings, 2000). Thus, key changes in curricular approaches were framed as 'epiphanies' within the critical commentary, having emerged from applied praxis (Denzin, 2014, p. 52). This recognition of continuum and context was supported by constructivist approaches to the narrative. As the espoused intention of the Professional Doctorate of Education by Portfolio was to ground this higher award in my own authentic professional practice, I was keen that my submission eschewed a normative PhD focus on a singular 'research question', and sought to adopt original and contextually appropriate methods of inquiry with respect to literature reviews, data collection, analysis, and so forth. In support of this approach, Charmaz, (2014. p. 306) argues (in the context of grounded theory methodology) that an early stage literature review need not automatically become a pre-requisite for doctoral inquiry, particularly where theoretical viewpoints and research data are being gathered by alternative, contextually relevant means. 'Received theory' emerging from narrowly focused literature reviews may become counter-productive to the espoused doctoral attribute of originality. In pragmatist terms, *'One should stop worrying about whether what one believes is well grounded and start worrying about whether one has been imaginative enough to think up interesting alternatives to one's present beliefs'* (Rorty, 1999, p.34). Consequently, autoethnographic process provided me with an appropriate methodology to evaluate and illuminate complexities of professional and curricular development (Denzin, 2014: Ellis & Bochner, 2000). An appropriate conceptual cycle for conducting auto-ethnographic inquiry consequently informed this process:

1. Frame the experience in context;
2. Embed the author's stance in theory;
3. Frame the story;
4. Confirm the narrative;
5. Conclude;
6. Share and illuminate the narrative and findings; and commencing the cycle again with
7. Frame the experience in context. (Hayes & Fulton, 2015)

Pragmatism as a paradigm for professional doctoral inquiry
Boshier (2009) presents a cogent argument that SoTL suffers from 'conceptual confusion', preventing its wider acceptance and application within universities and colleges. In response, the development of my reflective critical commentary afforded me the opportunity to crystallise a personal educational philosophy that sought to evaluate, synthesize, and apply a framework for curricular development, reconceptualising this 'Big Tent' of SoTL practices. My literature review reflected the wide range of texts that had shaped my practice and beliefs, including relevant writings pertaining to my former professional practice as an architect, as well as my current practice in higher education. This review contributed to the development of a theoretical framework for curricular design, drawing upon an emergent paradigm (pragmatism) to contextualise the commentary and the portfolio works. The philosophical worldview of Pragmatism has been characterised as *'antiformalist: it represents a principle of endless assault on every tendency to erect contingent knowledge into a formal system'* (Menand, 1997, p.xxxi). Such challenging of assumed truths is value-driven, favouring theories or beliefs that bring practical benefits to practices and society (Ormerod, 2006), underpinning my approach to an inquiry that reflected the aims and values of professional doctoral inquiry, as conceptualized in Table 1.

Moreover, this Pragmatist 'turn' informed the research design of my doctoral inquiry, as well as the variety of applied methodologies employed and the practical nature of portfolio components to improve students' learning experiences. Context was explicitly considered in the thesis, supporting a holistic and

divergent approach to educational research, departing from reductive, positivist epistemologies. This pragmatist approach helpfully supported curricular inquiry by providing scope for contextual complexity through consideration of 'curriculum as praxis', thus proposing a curricular model that considers authentic problems, imaginative solutions, and committed, informed action from both students and staff in shaping practices; *'Praxis takes place in the real, not the hypothetical world. It follows from this principle that the construction of the curriculum cannot be divorced from the act of 'implementation'* (Grundy, 1987, p.115). Modelling curriculum as praxis thereby offered a pragmatic, developmental and iterative course of action, requiring active, self-reflection that may be supported by formal and informal staff development mechanisms; academic staff development is championed repeatedly by educational theorists as essential to the improvement of curricular design (Stenhouse, 1975, p.142; Carr & Kemmis, 1986, p.40; Grundy, 1987, p. 191, Badley, 2001, p.168). In developing a professional doctorate that sought to fuse critical, reflective practice with concrete action, Pragmatism's particular emphasis on criticality usefully afforded a worldview that could address both theoretical and practical needs. A deeper engagement with Pragmatism identified several key themes of this worldview that resonated with the aims of my thesis:

Collaboration: my professional practice (as both educator, and formerly as a practicing architect) has demanded collaborative engagement with diverse *'communities of practice'* at local, institutional and (inter)national levels. The portfolio components therefore reflected this broad range of joint activities, which all support an over-arching aim of improving higher education practice and the individual and collective student experience. Notions of collaboration and joint enterprise suffuse the broad philosophy of Pragmatism, drawing upon ideas of communal, reflective equilibrium and communicative ethics (Maxcy, 1991, p.16; Rorty, 1991, p.184).

Utility: Practical consequences of the application of theory are foregrounded throughout the canon of pragmatism, with the importance of action and implementation over abstract speculation being continually championed; *'what concrete difference will its being true actually make…? What experiences (may) be different from those which would obtain if the belief were false?...What, in short, is the truth's cash-value in experiential terms?'* (James, 2002, p.v). In championing *praxis,* the practical interaction of applying theory and ideas to 'good work', coupled with the will to deal with the consequences, are privileged over speculation. Actions, application and participation are embraced by pragmatism, clearly distinguishing this paradigm from a purely theoretical approach to inquiry (Haack, 2004, p.14). Employment of creative abductive research methods (as espoused by C.S.Pierce) similarly champions methodological creativity through a focused emphasis on the intended outcomes of the inquiry.

Language: In common with much of 20th century philosophy, language formed a central theme of Pragmatism. James famously conceptualised of *'truth as agreement'*, in opposition to the positivist conception of truth being an inviolable fact, located somewhere 'out there'. Modern pragmatism's approach to language seeks to dissolve, rather than solve, problems through conversation, discussion, consensus, as embraced in related theories of communicative action as espoused by Gadamer (2004) and Habermas (1984). Rorty, in particular, espouses an *'enlarged conversation among texts of science and the humanities to help transcend current dead and misleading metaphors'* (Melles, 2008, p.98). As a practical example, communicative clarity and consensus between the beneficiaries of engagement for the collaborative development of courses of study was reflected in my thesis' inquiries into academic literacies (e.g. Race, 2014).

Complexity: Pragmatism eschews the reductionist approach of atomising themes into reduced and measurable data, divorced from context; '*Positivism, at its core, is rationality via exclusion'* (Reed, 2010, p.24). Curricular design (in common with architectural design) is a complex network of interrelated,

complementary and contradictory influences and factors, requiring balance, hierarchy and vision to achieve optimum results; no singular, absolute or finite conclusion can be reached. Consequently, the search for absolute truths serves no practical purpose in this arena, and a move towards dialogical and consensual understandings and agreements brings operational and functional benefits to creating a socially constructed curriculum.

Contingency: Acknowledging this complexity, the curriculum can be viewed as a messy, 'wicked' problem, subject to new conversations driven by policies, technologies, strategies, and unforeseen events. Pragmatism recognises contingency as an integral part of such unfinished and unending projects, and places its emphasis on the intended direction of travel, in education and elsewhere, towards a fairer, more just and equitable society. It refuses to close the door on the countless possible routes to achieve this goal, seeking consensus and solidarity through continual conversation (Rorty, 1998)

Social Hope: A future-facing and value-driven orientation is a key driver of pragmatism. In particular, Dewey emphasised the link of education to social equity, seeking to engender *'democratic values – reliance on the intelligence of the common man, opportunities for everyone to develop their talents – as informing good education'* (Haack, 2004, p.20). Pragmatism seeks to move incrementally towards a fairer, more open-minded and less cruel society; *'A world in which the process values of dialogue, conversation, phronesis, practical discourse, and judgement are linked to the universal values of solidarity, participation, unity, and mutual recognition'* (Maxcy, 1991, p.20). Wood and Cajkler (2018) similarly posit a model of SoTL that recognises *'the need for an explicit moral dimension in practice'* (p.323), supporting practitioners in developing a personal philosophy of social education that underpins their teaching and learning approaches.

Reflection: The Pragmatist writings of Dewey, mixing experience, interaction and reflection, have influenced reflective practice associated with authors such as Schon (1987), Boud et al: *'Reflection is an important human activity in which people recapture their experience, think about it, mull it over and evaluate it. It is this working with experience that is important in learning.'* (Boud et al. 1985, p.43).

Although pragmatism fell from popular favour in the late twentieth century, several commentators continued to champion Pragmatism's applicability to educational theory and research. Cherryholmes encapsulated the relevance of this paradigm with respect to the practical development of curricular design; *'Why pragmatism? A short answer is that pragmatism looks to consequences that we endlessly bump up against. We respond to and live with outcomes all day, every day. These results come from our actions and those of others. They also come from events beyond our control. Pragmatists anticipate outcomes. They look to imagined and actual outcomes'* (Cherryholmes, 1999, p.3).

Developing the framework: *'A curriculum for engagement in architectural education'*
My chosen outputs were then mapped in relation to key institutional and national policy drivers in higher education (e.g. assessment, employability, research-rich learning, technology enhanced learning etc.) Through this evaluation, a dominant theme of 'student engagement' emerged, providing a focus for my critical commentary. Aligning with the broad and comprehensive metaphor of the 'big tent', an individuated conceptualisation of 'curriculum' provided a) an apposite framework for deeper interrogation of my practice, b) a vehicle for evaluating interventions that addressed student engagement, and c) the development of a personal philosophy towards enhancing engagement in architectural education, embedding Pragmatist reflection into the narrative. My 'contingent' literature review, in combination with the coding of emergent themes and keywords from my SoTL outputs, formulated a set of recurrent 'goals for engagement', enabling a re-reading of my inquiries to date with respect to my

theorization of the curriculum of engagement (Table 2.).

Table 2. Establishing the Goals of a 'Curriculum for Engagement'.

Keywords	literature sources	goal
belonging / collaboration / community / participation	Bernstein, 1996; Boud & Falchikov, 2007; Bovill et al., 2011; Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Coates, 2005; Cook-Sather et al., 2014; Kuh et al., Kuh, 2013; Little et al., 2009; QAA, 2015; Rorty, 1989; Schon, 1985; Wenger, 1999	**SOCIALIZATION**
autonomy / diversity independence /	Adams & Brown, 2006; Bandura, 1997; Baxter Magolda, 2001; Bernstein, 1996; Gardner, 2007; Healey & Jenkins, 2009; Honey & Mumford, 1992; Jung, 1989; Kolb & Kolb, 2004; Mann, 2007; McClean, 2009; Pink, 2011; Robinson & Aronica, 2010;	**INDIVIDUATION**
communication / consensus/ dialogue / literacy	Bryson et al., 2010; Freire, 1970; Glassick et al., 1997; Habermas, 1984; Krause, 2005; Price et al., 2012; Rorty; 1985; Sara & Parnell, 2014; Race, 2014; Schon, 1985; Solomonides & Martin, 2008;	**COMMUNICATION**
authenticity / contingency / complexity / uncertainty	Barnett 2000a, 2000b; Bernstein, 1996; Biggs & Tang, 2011; Clouder et al., 2012; Knight, 2001; Lave & Wenger,1991; Roberts, 2007; Rorty, 1998; Sambell et al., 2013; Till, 2009; Vygotsky, 1987	**SOPHISTICATION**
challenge/ intentionality / mastery/ purpose /	Claxton, 2002; Coates, 2005; Kreber, 2013; Kuh et al., 2006; Meyer & Land, 2005; Mezirow, 2009; Pink, 2011; Reid & Solomonides,2007; Robinson & Aronica, 2010; Sennett, 2008; Webster, 2001;	**TRANSFORMATION**
application/ creativity / imagination/ synthesis /	Baume, 2001;, Claxton, 2006 ; Conti et al., 1995; Craft et al., 2008; Cropley, 2001; Deakin Crick et al, 2004; Healey & Jenkis, 2009; Kuh, 2012; Pink, 2011; Sennett 2008; Reid & Solomonides, 2007; Robinson & Aronica, 2010	**CREATION**
criticality/ critique / reflection/	Claxton, 1998; Dewey, 1910; Boud et al., 1985; DeBacker et al., 2009; Glassick et al., 1997; Johns, 2000; Kreber, 2013; Light et al., 2009; Savin-Baden, 2011; Schon, 1987, 2002; Webster, 2001, 2004;	**REFLECTION**

Subsequently, I mapped these goals to three conceptual 'dimensions' of curricula – 'context', 'knowledge' and 'process' – in order to develop a theoretical framework for this 'Curriculum for Engagement' that could be applied practically, and interrogated reflectively in future developments of the architectural study programmes. This then served as a model for holistic student engagement through a representation of 'curriculum' as a complex and purposive web of experiences and activities, expanding the narrow margins of a syllabus of content transmission:

> A curriculum for engagement…calls for a teaching that is likely to engage, to connect, to lift, to enthuse and even to inspire. A curriculum for engagement, in other words, calls for a pedagogy for

engagement. It is a pedagogy of deep and abiding respect for each student, of generosity and of space and time. It is a pedagogy in which the students are enabled to develop a strong voice, but a voice that is responsive to others and the challenges and standards inherent in the experiences opened up'

(Barnett & Coate, 2005, p.148).

The negotiated elements submitted for examination were the 30,000 word critical commentary, addressing the wider context that had generated my SoTL outputs, and the portfolio of components, each of which was individually evaluated against the emergent curricular framework as part of a reflexive process. Declarations of authorship were provided for each output, establishing my personal contributions to collaborative projects. In addition, a comprehensive Curriculum Vitae was appended to the commentary, providing further background and context for the reader's benefit.

Reflections on the professional doctorate by portfolio
I embraced the Professional Doctorate by Portfolio route as a valid process that reflected the practicalities of SoTL inquiries (in terms of scale, number and rigour), as well as the 'big tent' of diverse academic practices in Higher Education. The portfolio format enabled me to include small-scale and alternative forms of scholarship, inquiry and collaboration, capturing the situated and broad activities of my practices and intentions. The process of curating and evaluating a personally relevant and contextually specific portfolio of outputs (in a variety of media and methods of dissemination) supported my claim for doctoral level 'originality' in terms of form and outputs, as well as content. The accompanying critical commentary allowed me to crystallise an emergent philosophy of education that reflected my personal ethos, enabling me to apply this to curricular design. I rejected a narrowly-focused literature review in favour of systematic and critical reflection upon data sources accumulated throughout my career of professional practice. This reflects Pragmatist and SoTL notions of *'what works?'* through acknowledging diverse texts which continue to influence my practice (including my developing model of student engagement), This approach was constructivist, acknowledging my own past, present and developing knowledge and experience, and pluralistic in its synthesis of a diverse body of policy, practice and theoretical sources in seeking to establish consensus between these various fields.

The supervisor's role was essential to establishing a dialogue that respected this Pragmatist approach, through supporting imaginative possibilities over reductive process. This philosophical turn of 'knowledge as conversation' thereby constructively shaped the commentary, whilst rigorously challenging *a priori* assumptions of my practices, knowledge, and beliefs. 'Supervision' consequently concerned the development of 'enlarged vocabularies' in seeking consensual understandings and new conceptualisations.

Mason (2018), Maxwell (2003) and Neumann (2005) all usefully acknowledge the many challenges facing candidates who choose alternative routes to doctoral education. Breaking established assessment moulds is neither easy nor comfortable, entailing both risk and negotiation. My doctoral output was appreciably different from normative doctoral theses, however, as the process allowed me to present a context-specific example of higher-level scholarship that practically addressed the multiple demands of full-time professional practice in academia. In support of colleagues whose commitment to SoTL may find minimal or derisory recognition from their employers, this model of the Professional Doctorate by Portfolio may provide a feasible route for academic and support staff (as well as professionals beyond the institution) to achieve an authentic and appropriate doctoral award.

Acknowledgements

References

Apple, M.W. (1990) *Ideology and Curriculum*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Badley, G. (2009) 'Publish and be doctor-rated: the PhD by published work', *Quality Assurance in Education,* 17(4), pp. 331-342.

Barnett, R. and Coate, K. (2005) *Engaging the Curriculum in Higher Education.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Biesta, G. (2014) 'Pragmatising the curriculum: bringing knowledge back into the curriculum conversation, but via pragmatism', *The Curriculum Journal,* 25(1), pp. 29-49.

Boshier, R. (2009) 'Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning such a hard sell?', *Higher Education Research and Development*, 28(1), pp.1-15

Boud, D., Keogh, R., and Walker, D. (1985) *Reflection, turning experience into learning*. London: Kogan Page.

Boyer, E.L. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Profession*. Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. (1986) *Becoming critical*. London: RoutledgeFarmer.

Cherryholmes, C. (1999) *Reading Pragmatism.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Chick, N.L. (2014) '"Methodologically Sound" Under the "Big Tent": An Ongoing Conversation', *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 8(2), Article 1.

Denzin, N.K. (2014) *Interpretive Autoethnography*. 2nd edn. Los Angeles: Sage.

Ellis, C. and Bochner, A.P. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity', in Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of qualitative research.* 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. pp. 733-768.

Entwistle, N.J. (2009) *Teaching for understanding at university: deep approaches and distinctive ways of thinking.* Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Felten, P. (2013) 'Principles of Good Practice in SoTL', *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(1), pp. 121-125.

Gadamer, H.G. (2004) *Truth and Method.* 2nd edn. New York: Continuum.

Gale, H. (2008) Linking the Learning and Teaching and Human Resource Strategies via the Development of a Professional Doctorate. Available at: http://slideplayer.com/slide/3888348/ (Accessed: 31 May 2015)

Garrison, J. (2005) 'Curriculum, Critical Common-Sensism, Scholasticism, and the Growth of Democratic Character', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 24(3-4), pp. 179-211.

Gibbs, G. (1988) *Learning by Doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods.* London: Further Education Unit.

Grundy, S. (1987) *Curriculum: Product or Praxis?* Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.

Haack, S. (2004) 'Pragmatism, Old and New', *Contemporary Pragmatism,* 1(1), pp. 3-41.

Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol.1: Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Hayes, C. and Fulton, J. (2015) 'Autoethnography as a Methodology for Focused Introspection by Professional Doctoral Students', *The Three Rivers Annual Learning and Teaching Conference 2015,* Sunderland, 27 March 2015. Available at:
https://3riversnortheast.wordpress.com/conference-archives/conference-2015/paperworkshop-presentations/ (Accessed: 19 July 2015).

Holgate, P. (2015) 'Developing an inclusive curriculum of architecture for students with dyslexia', *Art, Design & Communication in Higher Education*, 14(1), pp. 87-99.

Huber, M.T. and Hutchings, P. (2005) *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*.

San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P. (ed.) (2000) *Opening lines: Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning*. Menlo Park, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

James, W. (2002) *The Meaning of Truth*. New York: Dover Publications Inc.

Johns, C. (2000) *Becoming a Reflective Practitioner.* 3rd edn. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Lee, A., Brennan, M. and Green, B. (2009) 'Re-imagining doctoral education: professional doctorates and beyond', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(3), pp.275-287.

Mason, S., (2018) 'Publications in the doctoral thesis: challenges for doctoral candidates, supervisors, examiners and administrators', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 37(6), pp.1231-1244.

Maxcy, S.J. (1991) *Educational leadership: a critical pragmatic perspective.* New York: Bergin & Garvey

Maxwell, T.W. and Kupczyk-Romanczuk, G. (2009) 'Producing the professional doctorate: The portfolio as a legitimate alternative to the dissertation', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 46(2), pp.135-145.

Melles, G. (2008) 'New Pragmatism and the Vocabulary and Metaphors of Scholarly Design Research', *Design Issues*, 24(4), pp. 88-101.

Menand, L. (ed.) (1997) *Pragmatism: A Reader*. New York: Vintage.

Muldoon, R. (2010) 'What does a Professional Doctorate Portfolio look like?', *ergo*, 1(3), pp. 35-43.

Neumann, R. (2005) 'Doctoral differences: Professional doctorates and PhDs compared', *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management*, 27(2), pp.173-188.

Ormerod, R. (2006) 'The history and ideas of pragmatism', *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 57(8), pp. 892-909.

Race, P. (2014) *Making Learning Happen: A Guide for Post-Compulsory Education.* 3rd edn. London: Sage.

Reason, P. (2015) Pragmatist Philosophy and Action Research: Readings and Conversation with Richard Rorty. Available at: http://peterreason.eu/Papers/Rorty.pdf. (Accessed: 19 July 2015).

Reed, I.A. (2010) 'Epistemology Contextualized: Social-Scientific Knowledge in a Postpositivist Era', *Sociological Theory,* 28(1), pp.20-38.

Robins, L. and Kanowski, P. (2008) 'PhD by publication: A student's perspective', *Journal of Research Practice*, 4(2), Article M3, pp. 1-20.

Rorty, R. (1991) *Objectivity, Relativism and Truth: Philosophical Papers Volume 1.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1998) *Contingency, Irony and Solidarity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rorty, R. (1999) *Philosophy and Social Hope.* London: Penguin.

Schon, D.A. (1987) *Educating the reflective practitioner: towards a new design for teaching and learning in the professions.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Shin, J.C., Kehm, B.M, & Jones, G.A. (eds.) (2018) *Doctoral Education for the Knowledge Society: Convergence or Divergence in National Approaches?* Cham: Springer International Publishing AG

Shulman, L.S. (2005) 'Signature pedagogies in the professions', *Daedalus,* 134(3), pp. 52-59.

Smith, S. (2015) *PhD by published work: a practical guide for success*. London: Palgrave

Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An introduction to curriculum research and development*. London: Heinemann Educational.

Tierney, A. (2019) 'The scholarship of teaching and learning and pedagogic research within the disciplines: should it be included in the research excellence framework?', *Studies in Higher Education*, pp.1-11.

Trigwell, K. (2013) 'Evidence of the Impact of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Purposes', *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal*, 1(1), pp. 95-105.

Vanderstraten, R. and Biesta, G. (2006) 'How is education possible? Pragmatism, Communication and the Social Organisation of Education', *British Journal of Education Studies,* 54(2), pp.160-174.