NATIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAM

RESEARCH REPORT

Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions

Melanie Williams
timeFUTURE

Fleur Goulding
HOLMESGLEN

Terri Seddon
MONASH UNIVERSITY

NCVER

Australian Government
Department of Industry, Innovation
Science, Research and Tertiary Education

NCVER

Australian Government
Department of Industry, Innovation
Science, Research and Tertiary Education

Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions

Melanie Williams
timeFUTURE

Fleur Goulding
Holmesglen

Terri Seddon
Monash University

NATIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
AND TRAINING RESEARCH PROGRAM

RESEARCH REPORT

Publisher's note

Additional information relating to this research is available in *Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions: support document*. It can be accessed from NCVER's website <http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2599.html>.

To find other material of interest, search VOCED (the UNESCO/NCVER international database <http://www.voced.edu.au>) using the following keywords: knowledge sharing, providers of education and training, quality, skills and knowledge, teaching and learning, vocational education and training, higher education.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge and thank the VET Development Centre as lead agent in the research consortium for its extensive support to the project. We especially acknowledge the generous contribution of Melinda Waters as Project Manager and the ongoing encouragement and commitment by Denise Stevens, CEO. We also acknowledge the intellectual contribution of Richard Bawden to the preliminary shaping of ideas for this project.

This document should be attributed as Williams, M, Goulding, F & Seddon, T 2013, *Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions*, NCVER, Adelaide.

ISBN 978 1 922056 47 4
TD/TNC 111.06

COVER IMAGE: THINKSTOCK/GETTY IMAGES

Published by NCVER, ABN 87 007 967 311

Level 11, 33 King William Street, Adelaide SA 5000
PO Box 8288 Station Arcade, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia

P +61 8 8230 8400 **F** +61 8 8212 3436 **E** ncver@ncver.edu.au **W** <http://www.ncver.edu.au>

About the research

Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions

Melanie Williams, timeFUTURE Consulting, Fleur Goulding, Holmesglen, and Terri Seddon, Monash University

The increasing prevalence of primarily vocational education and training (VET) institutions delivering higher education qualifications has raised questions about the place for scholarship in these institutions. Scholarship is not commonly associated with the VET sector. Rather, teachers and trainers are expected to have the appropriate technical skills and knowledge of the subjects they are teaching and to be up to date with industry practice. This is essentially the 'knowledge' that teachers and trainers need and it is conceptually similar to the 'knowledge' required by university lecturers. In the latter case, the usual label is 'scholarship' and there is a vast literature defining the concept. One particularly influential framework is that of Ernest Boyer with its four forms of knowledge — discovery, integration, application and teaching — and it is this framework the researchers adopt in this project.

Key messages

- Even though the term 'scholarship' is not normally associated with VET, it was clear from the research that Boyer's four forms of scholarship are relevant to the VET sector and are being practised. Examples of discovery included making films and composing music to be shared with students, while integration involved attending multidisciplinary networks and seminars. In terms of application, examples included participation in action research projects and ensuring their relevance to industry. Moreover, scholarship in VET is mainly related to teaching and learning rather than being discipline-based.
- Scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions combines elements of scholarship from both the VET and higher education sectors. It focuses on individual practices, has an industry focus and is mainly undertaken in the areas of teaching and learning. However, as in the higher education sector, it recognises the role of critical reflection, the need to place the scholarly practice within the broader literature, and the necessity of addressing social and ethical issues.

Given the move towards delivering higher education in VET institutes there is increasingly a need for scholarship in VET. Developing a shared language will help the teachers/lecturers in these institutes.

Tom Karmel
Managing Director, NCVER

Contents

Appendices

Executive summary

The project

This project addresses the question of what constitutes scholarship in three distinct Australian tertiary education settings — higher education, mixed-sector and vocational education and training (VET). The integrated tertiary environment emerging in the wake of the Bradley Review of Higher Education (2008) and other policy and legislative reforms mean that it is timely to address this issue. The project uses the concept of 'scholarly practice' to understand the established patterns and emerging practices of knowledge building in Australia's tertiary education system and to identify the criteria used to judge the quality of that practice.

We report on research that investigated the way practitioners who work in universities and in VET and in 'mixed-sector' public providers build knowledge through scholarly practice in their workplaces. The study involved three major phases.

- A literature review clarified and informed our understanding of 'scholarship' and 'quality scholarly practice' and enabled us to think about scholarly practice as a particular form of labour that proceeds through dialogue and is conducted within specific terms and conditions of work.
- Narratives and reflective commentaries on scholarly practice in relation to learning and teaching in the three settings were examined using text analysis techniques. This procedure revealed similarities between the three settings, with knowledge building occurring and considered important in all. Scholarly practice was endorsed because it produced knowledge that was seen to have value individually, educationally and institutionally. The analysis also revealed differences between settings: in the way scholarly practice was represented; the words used to describe knowledge building and the practices that produced knowledge and knowledgeable practice; and the terms and conditions of scholarly work under which knowledge was produced.
- The initial text analysis was validated and expanded through a stakeholder forum involving participants from universities, VET, mixed-sector public providers and the policy community. This stakeholder consultation confirmed shared understandings of the importance of knowledge, the work of building knowledge and the broad approaches to scholarly practice across the three settings. It also provided information about: other forms of scholarship as they are understood and practised in each sectoral location; criteria that could be used to define 'quality scholarly practice'; and practical strategies for supporting and enhancing scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions.

Findings

This project has established the existence, value and stakeholder endorsement of knowledge and knowledge building through quality scholarly practice across the tertiary education sector. Scholarly practice across all three settings involves a set of distinct procedures, individualised reflective practice, systematic inquiry and processes of knowledge sharing. It is distinguished by three features. First, it is a form of intellectual-practical work, moving iteratively between established ideas, practical activities and new ideas. It occurs in workplaces under specific terms and conditions and where specific purposes and expectations prevail. Second, the knowledge produced through scholarly practice is influenced by the way that work is done, and it is the scholarly character of that work

rather than compliance with a set of activities that defines 'quality scholarly practice'. Third, the quality of scholarly practice and the knowledge resources produced are enhanced when the processes and products of knowledge building are open to scrutiny and dialogue, which encourages refinement of the knowledge-building processes and products.

Scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions reflects the hybrid nature of those institutions. It shares some distinguishing features with VET and some with higher education. Some of these characteristics, such as the highly individualised practices of knowledge building in VET and mixed-sector institutions, reflect institutional constraints rather than acknowledged good practice. Shared terminologies, such as 'peer review' and 'making knowledge public', and the way they were understood and practised, also differed in each location. Yet there was considerable convergence in the criteria identified by practitioners across all three settings in defining quality scholarly practice. The principle that good practice in knowledge building was necessary if robust and useful knowledge was to be produced as a public resource was strongly endorsed by all stakeholders. It was valued because it could be used to enhance learning, problem-solving and innovation in enterprises and communities across Australia.

Introduction

The reform of Australia's higher education and VET sectors is a means of widening and deepening the skills necessary for a competitive knowledge economy. This reform agenda is evident globally and is driving increased investment in education. A more integrated tertiary education sector offers a means of concentrating and harnessing knowledge building in ways that enhance learning, problem-solving and innovation across workplaces and everyday life. Yet what is involved in increasing people's knowledge-building capacity — and the implications for workforce development within the education and training industry — are less clear.

Policies related to skills formation, innovation, industry support and the recognised expertise and qualifications of teachers display little common ground in relation to processes of knowledge building. At the national level, the Review of Australian Higher Education (Bradley et al. 2008) encouraged the formation of an integrated tertiary education sector, while the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) endorsed qualification targets across all levels of the national education and training system. The Australian Government is driving reforms of research and innovation (Cutler 2008), research assessment (Australian Research Council 2011) and reviews of VET teacher skills and qualifications (Productivity Commission 2011). These policies are reordering established understandings and practices of knowledge building at a time when public understandings of the quality of knowledge are challenged because of the World Wide Web's growing significance and the escalating media profile of debates between scientists and sceptics.

Reinforcing public understanding of what counts as 'knowledge' and how its quality is embedded in the practices of building knowledge is an important task for tertiary education providers. Their capacity to do this work depends upon shared understandings of what constitutes knowledge and the criteria that define scholarly practice. It also depends upon the skills of tertiary education practitioners and their terms and conditions of work, both of which enable them to engage in and develop their knowledge-building skills as a basis for teaching others (learners and colleagues). In Victoria, the proliferation of mixed-sector tertiary education providers alongside established higher education and VET providers offers a context for researching the scholarly practice and terms and conditions of work that support knowledge building in tertiary education settings.

Mixed-sector tertiary institutions

Following 2003 legislation in Victoria, VET institutions began to develop and deliver higher education courses, becoming known as mixed-sector institutions, a term which refers to organisations 'that offer tertiary programs outside the sector of their initial establishment and the sector of the majority of their enrolments'(Moodie 2012, p.1). It applies particularly to VET institutions like TAFE (technical and further education) institutes, which are now providing programs that lead to higher education qualifications. Mixed-sector institutions are continuing to emerge in Victoria and in other states, partly in response to the 2008 Bradley Review of Australian Higher Education. They constitute a new higher education setting, one which is informed by the traditions and cultures of both higher and vocational education.

Although some TAFE institutes have been developing and delivering higher education courses for several years, recent research findings and audit reports indicate that the scholarly culture required to support their higher education provision is still at an early stage of development (Australian

Universities Quality Agency 2009a, 2009b, 2010; Goulding & Seddon 2011; Wheelahan et al. 2009). Thus, as sectoral boundaries continue to blur in the integrating tertiary education sector, the nature of scholarship in mixed-sector institutions has surfaced as a hot spot of reform. This is particularly evident in mixed-sector VET institutions, where the dominant legacy of VET culture and practice confronts new expectations about scholarly practice rooted in higher education traditions. It is both a consequence and an expression of the institutionalised 'sectoral distinctions and cultural hierarchies' in higher and vocational education (Wheelahan et al. 2012, p.33). Since these divisions are reported to be less significant in private mixed-sector providers (Moodie 2012; Wheelahan et al. 2012), our research concentrates on scholarship and scholarly practice in public tertiary education institutions. Furthermore, although we consider and draw upon aspects of scholarship in VET and university contexts, the research focuses in particular on the scholarship associated with the provision of higher education in TAFE institutes since it is from these institutions that new practices are emerging.

There has been little attempt to generate shared understandings of what is meant by 'scholarship', 'research' and 'scholarly culture' in the post-Bradley tertiary education sector, specifically, of the development of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions. Higher education norms of scholarship with their roots in university traditions and organisational structures do not capture the applied orientation of higher education courses in TAFE institutes; they are framed by the established traditions and understandings of good practice in knowledge building of VET cultures. This applied approach has been identified as a 'distinctive, although not unique', feature of courses (Wheelahan et al. 2009, p.3) and of the approach to teaching and scholarship in mixed-sector institutions (Goulding & Seddon 2011; Pardy & Seddon 2011).

Scholarly practice is developing in mixed-sector institutions at the interface between the higher and vocational education traditions (Goulding & Seddon 2011). Understanding the nature of these emerging scholarly practices, and their affiliations with both the higher and vocational education traditions and innovations, warrants research. Investigating the shared understandings of 'scholarship' and the distinctive features of 'quality scholarly practice' of each of the three sites, and their implications for teaching and learning and other institutional activities (Brew 2003), will allow more detailed discussions of ways of supporting and enhancing scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions, including practitioners' professional and occupational knowledge and practice.

Project aims

The aims of the project were to explore how scholarship is understood and practised across the Australian tertiary sector as a means of better understanding and supporting scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions. The research questions were:

- What is 'scholarship'?
- What are the features of the scholarly practice that occur across various locations within the Australian tertiary sector?
- What are the indicators of quality scholarly practice in Australian tertiary education?
- What are the implications of these understandings and where are the opportunities to intervene in enhancing scholarly practice in mixed-sector TAFE institutions?
- What practical strategies are needed to support and build capacity for scholarly practice in mixed-sector TAFE institutions?

Methodology

The project used a four-step research design to investigate the nature of scholarship and the strategies required to support quality scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions.

Step 1: Literature review

Three strands of literature were reviewed to clarify the nature of knowledge building and its connection to scholarly practice. First, we drew on literature relating to the nature of scholarship and indicators of quality scholarly practice to clarify existing definitions and understandings (Badley 2003; Boyer 1990; Brew 2003, 2010; Diamond 2002; Glassick, Huber & Maeroff 1997; Rice 2002; Schon 1983, 1995). Second, we extended these concepts by thinking about scholarship as a form of scholarly practice underpinned by intellectual work that builds knowledge in particular ways and settings (Connell 1983, 2007; Gibbons et al. 1994; Seddon & Malley 1998). Finally, we reviewed Australian, North American and UK research that had investigated the empirical development of scholarship at the interface between higher and vocational education in, for instance, higher education in further education (HE in FE) and community college settings (Levin 2003, 2004; Turner, McKenzie & Stone 2009; Turner et al. 2009; Young 2002) and in Australian VET providers (Goulding & Seddon 2011; Kelly, Wheelahan & Billett 2009; Moodie 2010, 2012; Moodie et al. 2009; Moodie et al. 2011; Wheelahan et al. 2009; Wheelahan, Arkoudis et al. 2012) . This literature provided a terminology for discussing scholarship and enabled us to think about scholarly practice as a particular task conducted within specific terms and conditions of work.

Step 2: Narratives of scholarly practice

Examples of knowledge building in higher education, VET and mixed-sector institutions were sought from practitioners working in each of these institutions. They were asked to describe the ways in which they were engaged in building knowledge about teaching and learning. The narratives provided three examples of scholarly practice from each tertiary sector location and were used as conversation starters at a forum convened to discuss knowledge building. Although not necessarily representative of scholarly practice in the three locations, the three examples will be illustrative of the kinds of practice considered to be 'scholarly' by those from each of the settings.

We deliberately asked the representatives to write about their scholarship in teaching and learning because it had been recognised in each of the locations. Focusing the cases on teaching and learning was a form of sampling, providing a window on a particular form of scholarship that clarified the meaning of scholarly practice, which could then be used to understand other forms of scholarship, such as the scholarship of discovery, integration and application (Boyer 1990). The similarities and differences in the narratives provoked reflections on the nature of scholarship across the three locations and across other forms of knowledge building.

The narrative writers were identified through our professional networks. They are all recognised for their contributions to their sectors, are reflective about their scholarly practice and have the ability to capture their work experience in writing. To avoid the VET portrayal being influenced by higher education conventions, it was decided to seek out a writer who was not currently engaged in postgraduate study. The writers of the VET and higher education narratives are New South Wales women, while the mixed-sector writer is a Victorian male. Ethics clearance was obtained through Monash University for the use of the narratives at the forum and for publication in the final report.[1]

[1] MUHREC approval number CF12/0393 – 2012000176 'Scholarly practice in tertiary education'.

The narratives contained two parts: a story about a specific instance where they had built knowledge about teaching and learning and a response to structured questions that probed the way they had conducted the case they described. The narratives, reflective commentaries and the briefs given to the narrative writers are contained in a support document.

Step 3: Textual analysis of narratives

A textual analysis of the three cases and the reflective commentaries of the narrative writers revealed processes of knowledge building in each setting. We used discourse analysis strategies to interpret these texts and refine our literature-based understandings of scholarship and quality scholarly practice. The analysis revealed similarities and differences between the three settings in relation to scholarly practice and the terms and conditions under which this work occurred. This analysis informed the design of the forum.

Step 4: A forum for dialogic[2] knowledge building

Through consultations with practitioners and stakeholders the forum provided an opportunity to validate the textual analysis and extend the analysis of scholarly practice in the three settings. It offered an opportunity to build knowledge, in and through dialogue and discussion, about the nature of scholarship and the ways in which it may be supported and enhanced in mixed-sector institutions. It also acted as a focus group for the triangulation and validation of the project team's analysis of the narratives and the conclusions we drew from these about quality scholarly practice.

Approximately 50 practitioners from all three tertiary locations, along with other stakeholders with interests in tertiary education, were invited to the forum. During the day, insights were shared about the narratives and everyday experience of scholarly practice across the three sectors, with the aim of refining and elaborating shared understandings about the:

- nature of scholarship and the similarities and differences in the way it is practised in each location
- indicators that distinguish quality scholarly practice
- strategies that will support and further develop scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector TAFE institutes.

We report on the findings of the forum and use these and our earlier work on the project to draw conclusions about the implications for quality scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions. This report represents the final synthesis of these methodological stages. A discussion on the limitations of this research can be found in appendix A.

[2] We use the term 'dialogic' throughout to signify that dialogue is a method of building knowledge. This notion of building knowledge *in* and *through* dialogue is central to the argument advanced in this report.

Defining scholarship

Brew (2010) observes that there have been many attempts to define the nature of scholarship in general and disciplinary terms, but notes that much of this literature takes a normative perspective, positioning scholarship as a set of activities of particular kinds. However, she cites the empirical work of Paulsen and Feldman (1995), who contend that, traditionally, teaching, research and community service activities have been seen as fundamental elements. In charting these developments in the literature, Brew (2010) contends that Ernest Boyer in his seminal text *Scholarship reconsidered* advanced the most notable redefinition of the concept of scholarship as four 'separate, yet overlapping, functions': the scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching (Boyer 1990, p.16). This broader meaning of scholarship brings legitimacy to the full range of work performed by academic staff in higher education institutions and also views the four scholarly functions as being 'tied inseparably to each other' (Boyer 1990, p.25). Table 1 summarises the key aspects of each function proposed by Boyer.

Table 1 Professorial work functions proposed by Ernest Boyer

Scholarship	Purpose	Traditions	Illustrative questions posed
Discovery (pp.17–18)	To contribute to the stock of human knowledge and the intellectual climate of a college or university	Investigation, research and freedom in intellectual inquiry	What is to be known, what is yet to be found?
Integration (pp.18–21)	To interpret, draw together and bring new insight to original research. To locate research in larger intellectual patterns. To make connections across disciplines, interpreting data and educating non-specialists	Synthesis, critical analysis, interpretation and multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary integration	What do findings mean? Is it possible to interpret what's been discovered in ways that provide a larger, more comprehensive understanding?
Application* (pp.21–3)	To apply knowledge dynamically, thereby creating new understandings. To engage with the larger community through service activities that are tied directly to a professional field of knowledge. To both apply and contribute to human knowledge	Service Interaction between theory and practice	How can knowledge be reasonably applied to consequential problems? How can it be helpful to individuals and institutions? Can social problems themselves define an agenda for scholarly investigation?
Teaching (pp.23–4)	To be well informed, steeped in disciplinary knowledge and intellectually engaged, and to transform and extend that knowledge through teaching	Ensuring the continuity of knowledge and inspiring others in scholarship	Unlike the other scholarships, Boyer does not exemplify his understanding of the scholarship of teaching with questions.

Note: *Rice (2002) refers to the 'scholarship of engagement' as having conceptually replaced the notion of a scholarship of application. He disputes the epistemological assumption of the scholarship of application, that knowledge is generated in the academy and then applied in external contexts, to advance the collaborative emphasis of engaged scholarship.

It is important to note that, while Boyer (1990) references the service traditions existing within the university context in framing his scholarship of application, he draws a sharp distinction between 'citizenship activities' (where staff perform important social and civic work in the interests of the public good) and projects that could be considered scholarly. He argues that 'to be considered scholarship, service activities must be tied directly to one's special field of knowledge … such service is serious demanding work, requiring the rigor — and the accountability — traditionally associated with research activities' (p.22).

The *National Protocols for Higher Education Approval Processes* (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a) have formed the basis of the regulatory requirements for Australian higher education provision. While these protocols no longer have regulatory authority

since the establishment of the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency, the new Course Accreditation Standards have been largely drawn from these existing protocols. Definitions are not included in the new threshold standards (Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education 2011). However, the predecessor national protocols do offer insight into how scholarship is conceived in the regulatory context. The national protocols are also significant for their historical influence over the establishment of mixed-sector provision in Australia. It should be noted that these protocols and the new threshold standards (Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education 2011) pertain only to the higher education component of mixed-sector provision. VET provision is regulated by separate standards (Standards for NVR Registered Training Organisations 2011).

In contrast to Boyer's model, which positions research as one subset of knowledge building within a larger construct of scholarship, the protocols offer separate definitions of research and scholarship. The meaning given to research follows the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) definition and is premised on the notion of systematic original investigation to increase and apply knowledge:

> Research comprises creative work and artistic endeavours undertaken systematically in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of humans, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications. Research is characterised by originality and includes creative activity and performance. It has investigation as a primary objective, the outcome of which is new knowledge, with or without a specific practical application, or new or improved materials, products, devices, processes or services. Research ends when work is no longer primarily investigative.
>
> (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a, pp.18—19)

However, unless they are involved in supervising research students, teachers in non-self-accrediting higher education institutions, such as mixed-sector TAFE institutes, are not obliged to conduct research. Rather, they are required to 'have a sound understanding of current scholarship and/or professional practice in the discipline in which they teach' (Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education 2011, p.16).

While these standards do not offer a definition of what scholarship might entail, the national protocols previously defined it narrowly, solely in relation to learning and teaching. Consistent with Brew's (2010) observation, the definition describes scholarship in terms of activities, which include:

- Demonstrating current subject knowledge and an ongoing intellectual engagement in primary and allied disciplines, and their theoretical underpinnings
- Keeping abreast of the literature and new research, including by interaction with peers, and using that knowledge to inform learning and teaching
- Encouraging students to be critical, creative thinkers and enhancing teaching understanding through interaction with students
- Engaging in relevant professional practice where appropriate to the discipline
- Being informed about the literature of learning and teaching in relevant disciplines and being committed to ongoing development of teaching practice
- Focusing on the learning outcomes of students.

(Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a, p.19)

The definition of scholarship in the national protocols has been extremely influential in shaping conceptions of scholarship in mixed-sector TAFE institutes. However, it is limiting in that it:

- fails to endorse forms of scholarship other than those relating to learning and teaching
- conceptualises scholarship in terms of activities rather than as an approach or way of practising that is embedded in day-to-day academic tasks. This makes it possible to separate scholarship 'activities' out from daily practice
- emphasises the dissemination of existing knowledge, not the generation of new knowledge, which arguably locks mixed-sector higher education teachers out of investigative and leadership roles within the academic community
- is silent on the quality of scholarly work and fails to convey any sense of criticality in engagement with knowledge, peers or one's own practice.

University understandings of scholarship that equate scholarship with research and imply a discipline-based focus are a further influence on conceptions of scholarship in mixed-sector TAFE institutes. The idea of a 'discipline base' is mostly treated as an abstract specification of knowledge, as in the disciplines of chemistry, psychology or economics, which offer specific knowledge about the world communicated via disciplinary discourses, or ways of using words. These abstract formulations fail to recognise that these disciplines are practical ways of knowing that develop and consolidate as different knowledge communities go about their work and establish traditions of knowing through their practice. They are perpetuated through regulatory processes that have been interpreted as requiring conformity with higher education sector norms (Australian Universities Quality Agency 2010), but without acknowledging the way those norms are embedded in higher education or the diversity of practice amongst university-based knowledge communities. As noted in the introduction, these abstract ideas about research and disciplines confront established VET traditions and understandings of good practice in knowledge building. Thus the historical sectoral associations with the terminology have migrated into the new environment, clouding the clear delineation and capture of emergent practices in this new mixed-sector context. As Moodie (2012) notes, the difficulties that mixed-sector institutions have in adequately addressing the scholarship requirements of higher education are partly because 'there is no clear understanding of what such scholarship might be' (p.3).

Boyer's four forms of scholarship may be used to address these limitations, allowing an expanded notion of scholarship as a practice of 'contextualised knowledge building' to emerge. Boyer (1990) references knowledge generation, advancement and application throughout his descriptions of the four functions of scholarly work. This more practical conception of scholarship is rooted in his belief that knowledge is not necessarily developed in a linear progression — from basic, to teaching and application functions. Instead, Boyer contends that a more inclusive and iterative view is needed, one which recognises 'that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice and through teaching' (p.24). The definition of scholarship contained in the national protocols (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a) also mentions research and research products (such as literature) as knowledge resources that inform teaching and learning. But it associates the production of new knowledge to enhance understanding and devise new applications as being characteristic of research.

This practice perspective on scholarship recognises that communities in different situations produce ways of thinking that help them to understand and act in the world but, because they operate in different contexts, the 'form of theorising is often different too' (Connell 2007, p.xii). Further, this approach presents the process of producing knowledge as a particular form of work that occurs in particular places; it develops knowledge about that world and produces discourses that are useful and

useable by that community. These practices of building knowledge, therefore, inform knowledgeable or 'knowing practice' (Kemmis 2005).

Understanding 'scholarship' as contextualised knowledge building offers a way of moving beyond conceptual and historical divisions. It overcomes the vexed question of the relationship between research and scholarship, in that both are fundamentally concerned with building knowledge. It is also a relatively neutral term that surmounts the historic sectoral divisions between higher education and VET by recognising that practitioners and learners in each tertiary education location engage in contextualised knowledge building. They both undertake intellectual work to produce useful and useable knowledge that informs their practice in their workplaces, communities and in service to their stakeholders.

This intellectual work occurs through scholarly practices in both higher education and VET and generates, integrates, applies and disseminates abstracted and de-contextualised knowledge resources (literature) for use in particular contexts, such as workplaces or industry and occupational communities. These scholarly practices also entail different patterns of producing knowledge:

- Mode 1 knowledge is associated with traditional university practices that build 'traditional "truths" accumulated over time … universal, objective, disciplined, planned, tested and reliable findings' through conventions that are governed by, and accountable to, academic interests and conceptions of good practice.
- Mode 2 knowledge production is a form of knowledge work that is not framed by traditional academic disciplines and is not specific to universities. It is 'trans-disciplinary rather than mono- or multi-disciplinary and occurs in non-hierarchical and varied forms. It is more open and accountable to diverse social interests of practitioners and users' (Gibbons et al. 1994).

This way of understanding scholarship informs our investigation of scholarly practice in tertiary education. It is a framework that:

- approaches scholarly practice as a type of work that is contextualised differently by the structures and cultures of higher education, VET and mixed-sector institutions
- highlights the characteristics that make work scholarly (rather than a set of activities), which may be used as criteria to guide and evaluate scholarly work in terms of qualitative assessments of the knowledge that is produced
- recognises that this qualitative assessment of scholarly practice occurs when knowledge resources are opened to public scrutiny and can be 'critiqued, reviewed, built upon and improved' (Huber 2001, p.22)
- grasps the distinctiveness of scholarly practice, in that it reflects the applied orientation of mixed-sector provision and enhances its emphasis on the relationship between theory and practice.

Quality in scholarly practice

This section of the report discusses notions of 'quality' in relation to scholarship in the literature and details the use of this literature to inform our analysis of the three narratives of scholarly practice commissioned as part of the project.

The regulatory documentation that has driven the development of scholarship in mixed-sector TAFE institutes is couched in terms of 'activities' (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a, 2007b). It emphasises 'what' practitioners should do when they engage in scholarly practice, but not 'how' they do it. This focus provides little basis for evaluating or improving that scholarship. To start to integrate a qualitative dimension into our understanding of scholarship as contextualised knowledge building, we drew primarily on the work of Charles Glassick and his colleagues. Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997) furthered Boyer's work and presented six standards by which the quality of scholarship can be measured across all four scholarly functions. These standards were developed based on their analysis of documents, such as institutional guidelines on hiring, promotion and tenure, the standards used by academic publishers and granting agencies to determine the scholarly merit of manuscripts and proposals, and forms used by students and peers to evaluate teaching. The authors claim that a work of scholarship must be characterised by clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, outstanding results, effective communication and a reflective critique. A summary of the six standards is presented in table 2.

Table 2 Scholarship standards proposed by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff (1997)

Standard	
Clear goals	Does the scholar: ▪ state the basic purpose of his or her work clearly? ▪ define objectives that are realistic and achievable? ▪ identify important questions in the field?
Adequate preparation	Does the scholar: ▪ show an understanding of existing scholarship in the field? ▪ bring the necessary skills to his or her work? ▪ bring together the resources necessary to move the project forward?
Appropriate methods	Does the scholar: ▪ use methods appropriate to the goals? ▪ apply effectively the methods selected? ▪ modify procedures in response to the changing circumstances?
Significant results	Does the scholar: ▪ achieve the results? ▪ add to the field? ▪ open additional areas for further exploration?
Effective presentation	Does the scholar: ▪ use a suitable style and effective organisation to present his or her work? ▪ use appropriate forums for communicating the work to its intended audiences? ▪ present his or her message with clarity and integrity?
Reflective critique	Does the scholar: ▪ critically evaluate his or her own work? ▪ bring an appropriate breadth of evidence to his or her critique? ▪ use evaluation to improve the quality of future work?

These standards and our literature review were used to analyse the three narratives and reflective commentaries commissioned for this project about how knowledge of teaching and learning is built in the tertiary sector. We identified four features that seemed significant in distinguishing good

scholarly practice: scholarship is a dynamic intersection between knowledge and practice; it is socially constructed and co-produced work; it is a form of learning, where scholars become self-critical inquirers; and it needs to be made public, with scholars accountable to their peers. The way in which the narratives reveal these features is outlined below.

Scholarship as a dynamic intersection between knowledge and practice

Boyer contends that theory leads to practice and practice leads to theory, that new understandings can arise out of the act of application, and that 'theory and practice vitally interact and one renews the other' (Boyer 1990, p.23). Badley (2003) concurs with this assessment, citing the work of Schön (1995), who argues that practice, including the practice of teaching, should be seen not only as a setting for the application of knowledge, but also for its generation. Badley goes on to extend this conception of practice as knowledge generation by drawing on the Deweyan notion of inquiry (reflection in and on action), Schön's ideas of design (reflection-in-action and reflection on reflection-in-action) to generate knowledge about practice, and Lewin's approach to action research (reflection on knowing and reflection-in-action giving rise to actionable theory).

While awareness of this dynamic interaction was evident in each sectoral narrative, they were manifested differently. The action research/action learning methodology employed in the VET case inherently involves a dynamic intersection between knowledge and practice, with the knowledge building portrayed in procedural terms and emphasising the processes undertaken, with little information given about content or contextual knowledge. The text revealed the use of this procedural orientation as a way of claiming scholarship. In the mixed-sector and higher education narratives, procedures were evident but less explicit. Knowledge was developed through reflective practices that acknowledged different ways of knowing and practising and through using literature and theory as explanatory tools to build new knowledge and reframe existing knowledge.

However, in the mixed-sector case, the knowledge interacting with and informing the practice was pedagogical and the contextual information was related to the political, economic and sectoral environment in which higher education provision takes place, with little reference to the narrator's 'industry discipline'. In contrast, while the higher education narrative also focused on the scholarship of teaching and learning, it is clear that it takes place within, and is shaped distinctively by, the industry discipline and the wider social and global context in which the industry practice occurs.

The VET case described scholarship undertaken as part of a 'special' project rather than as a depiction of everyday practice. The narrator was given funded time away from her normal job to participate in and document the project. In the mixed-sector case the scholarship was undertaken in unpaid time. Conversely, in the higher education portrayal, scholarly practice, although not detailed clearly, was embedded in the everyday practice of the narrator.

Scholarship as socially constructed and co-produced work

In his notion of the scholarship of integration, Boyer recognised that the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge building was coming to the fore in academic life: that scholarly practice increasingly involves communication with colleagues from other disciplinary fields coming together to discover 'patterns that connect' (Boyer 1990, p.20). He depicts the scholarship of teaching as involving not only the transmission of knowledge, but its transformation and extension as well. Badley (2003) expands this notion to argue that the scholarship of teaching is not just concerned with the transmissive, but also involves the co-production of knowledge between teachers and learners.

Further, in citing the work of Schön (1995), Badley suggests that these new forms of scholarship 'must take the form of action research … which in turn requires building up communities of inquiry capable of criticising such research and fostering its development' (Badley 2003, p.305).

The narratives emphasised different aspects of this way of conceiving scholarship. In taking problem-based learning as its focus, the mixed-sector narrative foregrounded Badley's (2003) notion of the co-production of knowledge between teacher and learner. Yet the building of knowledge *about teaching and learning* was portrayed in a highly individualised way. In contrast, in the VET and higher education narratives, knowledge was produced in multidisciplinary teams, following Schön's notion of 'communities of inquiry' (cited in Badley 2003, p.305). Both of these recognised the value of sharing knowledge in enhancing the quality of the scholarship through discussion and making wider resources available to the process of knowledge building. And while clearly evident in the action learning/action research project described, the collaboration portrayed in the VET narrative was not characteristic of everyday practice: it was again the outcome of a specially funded project. The text discloses how, prior to the project, unit coordinators had 'little interaction with others to validate or improve on their teaching and learning practices' and records the ongoing dilemma of how to extend collaborative knowledge building across discipline areas.

Knowledge building in the higher education narrative was public, dialogic and jointly produced — a consequence of interaction, not merely individual reflections, as emphasised in the mixed-sector narrative. The reflective practitioner does not just generate ideas and reflections but must draw on and process other sources (via literature or conversations) in producing new interpretations that may be recognised as new knowledge.

Scholarship as learning

In describing the scholarship of teaching, Boyer (1990, p.24) states that 'good teaching means that faculty, as scholars, are also learners', while Badley (2003) makes repeated references to Schön's ideas about the need for scholars to be self-critical inquirers in order to improve and develop their scholarly practice.

Once again, the narratives portrayed the learning aspect of scholarship in different ways. In the VET case, the project was scaffolded by a formal workforce capability development program for those involved in the project. Learning in the mixed-sector narrative was depicted in terms of the educator as co-learner with students: a self-improvement and practice-improvement aspect which is acquired through reading literature, reflection and a heuristic orientation to teaching and learning practice (and to a lesser extent through sharing ideas with colleagues), and through the author's formal postgraduate study.

In the higher education narrative, learning was a collaborative process involving the teaching team and senior academics, who recognised the scholarly authority of the team and their own need to learn from and with them. This collaborative learning was reported to challenge the scholar's own disciplinary assumptions 'providing critical insights to what I thought I knew'. As in the mixed-sector portrayal, the narrator concedes that knowledge is not fixed but must be critiqued and contested. Evidence of an awareness of this understanding is absent from the VET portrayal, where the tone emphasises guidance and support. Any sense of challenge or critique that might be inferred from references to 'frank and full discussions' or to reflection in the VET case appear to have applied to procedural matters, not to the knowledge being used or that being produced.

Scholarship made public and accountable to peers

Boyer (1990) asserts that scholarly work only becomes consequential once it is understood by others, and further, that the scholarship of application (engagement) must be characterised by rigour and accountability. Badley (2003) concurs with this public dimension of scholarship, citing the work of Huber (2001) to argue that the scholarship of teaching involves inquiry into learning, which is made public in ways that can be 'critiqued, reviewed, built upon and improved' (p.305). This entails grasping its underpinning knowledge frames, concepts and assumptions, which can be gleaned from the ways in which words are selected, given meaning and used for specific purposes. Badley further contends that the scholarship of teaching enables the production of flexible yet contested frameworks for current understandings. This work enables scholars to participate in and contribute to 'ongoing conversations' (p.307).

While the knowledge developed through the VET case was widely disseminated internally and in public forums, it is not clear that the primary intent was validating the knowledge building before peers. This function seemed to reside in managers and external 'experts' in this case rather than peers. For example, a senior manager 'allowed' a scholarly approach and 'recognised the potential of the knowledge', and the process was reviewed by 'expert researchers'.

The mixed-sector case did not entail processes to make the knowledge building public. Judgments about an individual's knowledge were made by the individual himself and new knowledge was also identified (claimed) in this way, rather than depending on the authority of others or responding to feedback (dialogue) from others. There was no explicit recognition that scholarship becomes knowledge by being made public and being recognised and endorsed by others.

The scholarly practice described in the higher education narrative is quite the reverse, being embedded in a public dialogic process that engages iteratively with knowledge and everyday life. This interplay is the basis for interpretation and a means of constructing knowledge resources for further discussion/knowledge building. It means that scholarship is always subject to public scrutiny and refinement. In contrast to the VET narrative in particular, in which some functions were delegated to unidentified actors, the public nature of the processes make the higher education case more explicit about whose knowledge was being used and, therefore, whose was not.

Conclusions about quality scholarly practice

Our analysis of the narratives leads us to conclude that quality scholarly practice entails:

- a set of procedures that disciplines the process of building knowledge and also communicates the process of scholarship, which informs others about the character of the scholarly practice
- individualised reflective practice, systematic inquiry and engagement with the world and the ways of capturing, representing and communicating about that world. This labour of intellectual work is fundamental to the process of working with and producing new knowledge (that is, undertaking knowledge/intellectual work). It is an iterative process of taking up and using knowledge resources (such as literature) to reframe existing ways of knowing, interpreting and understanding the world
- processes of knowledge sharing, which allow critical co-production and refinement of knowledge by making this knowledge public. This also recognises whose knowledge is being used and in what way. It includes building new ideas, concepts, problem definitions and solutions and also recognising, taking up and appropriating resources that endorse/authorise knowledge.

One of the starkest differences between the cases is the way these three dimensions are aggregated and disaggregated. In the higher education example of scholarly practice, one person undertakes them all in collaboration with others. In the VET case they are disaggregated. The narrator undertakes some aspects but part of the literature review, endorsement of the work, recognition of new knowledge and authorisation of that knowing practice are delegated to different identities, without also acknowledging who those different identities and what their different knowledges were. This disaggregation contributes to a sense of corporate ownership of the scholarly work rather than the individual authority of the scholar.

The mixed-sector case is more like the higher education case, but with less confidence about taking on the identity and authority of the 'knower' who undertakes scholarship. It is also more narrowly framed as an individual narrative about knowledge building, one that does not make claims about the value of that knowledge to others. This stance seems not to recognise fully the way that the process of building knowledge is embedded in relationships, communication patterns that are 'knowledge-ful' and organisational architectures that order knowledge and power.

The dynamics between scholarly practice and institutional settings

This section of the report explores the literature on the development of mixed-sector institutions and the ways in which teachers' scholarly practice in this context is mediated. It then uses this literature to explore related issues that surface in the narratives. Kelly, Wheelahan and Billett (2009) note that higher education provision by Australian TAFE institutes parallels the more established provision of higher education programs in internationally analogous institutions, such as community colleges in the United States and Canada and further education colleges in the United Kingdom. Therefore, much of the literature on higher education in VET contexts and the work of teachers in these settings is found in North America and the UK, although Australian-based studies are increasingly contributing to the knowledge base.

Institutional identity and cultures

Parry (2009) comments that the 'English experiment' of reinventing the mission of further education colleges to include the delivery of short-cycle sub-degree qualifications in collaboration with a higher education institution has resulted in an unstable, uncertain and increasingly complex environment for colleges. Further education colleges, according to Parry, have become sites for democratising access and participation in higher education while simultaneously diverting non-traditional students into lower-status settings (p.340). He contends that further education colleges are fragile and marginal settings for higher-level education as they face a lack of security over funding and no ownership of the development and delivery of their higher education qualifications. Parry, Davies and Williams (2004) conclude that the franchising and delivery of sub-degree higher education has led to an increasingly shared mission by the universities and colleges operating in this model. They argue that 'HE in FE' should be regarded as a hybrid form, as this removes the need for colleges to use the defensive language that is often attached to their positions in relation to their higher education delivery. This notion also gives claim to further education colleges being regarded as normal and necessary settings for higher education.

In the North American context, Levin (2004) examines the community colleges that have extended their programming to full baccalaureates. He argues that this expansion of college missions not only alters institutional purpose, but challenges institutional identity. Levin further argues that the fundamental assumptions, including the organisation's purpose, held by stakeholders and influencers of the organisation, alter in this context: they define their institution differently and regard their work context as changed. Levin identifies shifts in functional arrangements, such as structures and management processes. He also observes that agents of the institution seek to imitate higher-status institutions while retaining connections to community college missions and programs (Levin 2003). Like Parry, Davies and Williams (2004), Levin (2004) suggests that this hybrid organisational identity leads to a new institution, which may cause insoluble problems and resource stress.

In the Australian context Wheelahan et al. (2009) conclude that the sectoral distinctions between VET and higher education, with their different curriculum, funding, reporting, quality assurance and administrative arrangements, make it more difficult than necessary for TAFE institutes to develop their higher education provision. The authors call for consistent regulatory and funding arrangements,

a national framework of academic standards, a single tertiary education industrial award, and support for the development of higher education staff, pedagogy and curriculum within TAFE.

The effect of these shifts in organisational purpose, culture and conditions on the work of higher education teachers in mixed-sector settings is gaining increasing attention in the UK literature. The work of Wheelahan et al. (2009) on higher education in TAFE is also significant in the Australian context. In considering the practice of scholarship, these works raise issues of identity and the terms and conditions of work that shape scholarly practice. These issues are also reflected in the three narratives commissioned for this project.

Individual identities

Turner, McKenzie and Stone (2009) acknowledge that the professional identities of those working in any educational sector are complex and dynamic and depend on the conditions of practice, the individual's life history and their social/professional interactions. Young (2002), however, concludes that the professional identities of higher education lecturers in further education settings tend to be more strongly rooted in teaching, with a weaker identification with subject-based disciplines. Turner, McKenzie and Stone (2009) likewise find that the general traits of higher education lecturers can be identified in regard to the relationship they have to their students and their teaching and learning focused approach to scholarly activity. Turner, McKenzie and Stone (2009) point out, however, that engagement in scholarly activities impacts on the emerging professional identities of these teachers as higher education practitioners (p.261).

In Australian TAFE institutions, higher education teaching staff are reported to be left 'betwixt and between' as they straddle the two sectors (Kelly, Wheelahan & Billett 2009). The authors conclude that these teachers' identities are being shaped by the epistemological, pedagogical, industrial and institutional conditions they experience in their work. They argue that these identities are, however, bifurcated along sectoral lines, since teachers are located within a dominant VET environment while maintaining work practices associated with higher education. Wheelahan and her colleagues (2009) found that higher education teachers in mixed-sector settings generally perceived their identities in relation to their work as higher education teachers but some, particularly those coming from a creative and performing arts background, saw themselves primarily as professionals from that field of practice (pp.31—2).

These observations appear to be borne out in the narratives. For example, there is little evidence of disciplinary knowledge playing a part in the knowledge-building process in the mixed-sector case: pedagogy is the subject of the scholarly work. Indeed, the text states that the problem-based learning approach emulates other successful programs in unrelated discipline areas. However, there is no indication of whether or how problem-based learning has been contextualised to accommodate and reflect the industry discipline (building and construction) and its practices. Rather, the contextual information supplied in this case relates to the political, economic and sectoral environment in which mixed-sector provision takes place, rather than the disciplinary and social context as portrayed in the university-located case.

As has already been noted, there is little content or contextual information supplied in the VET narrative. In contrast to both of these cases, while the university-based narrative also focuses on the scholarship of learning and teaching, it is clear that it takes place within and is shaped distinctively by the industry discipline (engineering) and the wider social, and indeed global, context in which engineering practice occurs.

The terms and conditions shaping scholarly practice

Young (2002) evokes a sense of isolation and a lack of recognition in describing the experiences of the higher education teachers in the further education college in which her study is located. The author is particularly vocal about the way in which the prevailing further education college culture negatively affects scholarship. Young notes that the culture of the college is anti-academic and managerial and that, despite staff being conscious of the kinds of scholarship they would like to be involved in, there are many perceived barriers to the academic development of subject knowledge and to scholarship. Lack of time, loss of opportunities for promotion on the basis of teaching, poor support for scholarly exchange amongst staff and insufficient physical resources lead the author to conclude that the managerial ethos has squashed academic culture and created an environment — subsequently perpetuated by staff as well as management — in which 'scholarship is the word that dare not speak its name' (p.285). Turner, McKenzie and Stone (2009) likewise argue that it is around discussions of scholarly activity and research that barriers associated with cultural mismatch become most apparent. The teaching and learning award holders interviewed in their study speak of research being 'lost in the everydayness' and that scholarly activity is 'only really addressed when external agencies require it to be evidenced' (p.260).

Kelly, Wheelahan and Billett (2009) similarly conclude that higher education teachers in Australian TAFE institutes are organisationally located in a culture holding values incongruent with those underpinning higher education and that often management practices are not informed by understanding or insight into the work of higher education teachers. Wheelahan et al. (2009) conclude that institutions must engage in discussion and debate about what it means to construct a higher education culture and how higher education provision is, or should be, distinguished from VET. Fundamentally, however, Wheelahan et al. (2009) find key parallels between the experience of higher education teachers in TAFE and their counterparts in UK further education colleges. Teachers acknowledge that scholarship should underpin their higher education teaching, but that it is problematic. Workload arrangements, resourcing and lack of management support make this difficult to achieve. Goulding and Seddon (2010) find, however, that higher education teachers in TAFE are variously filtering, contesting and accommodating this reality. Their case study in a Victorian mixed-sector institution highlights the capability and commitment of higher education teachers in TAFE to engage in knowledge building related to professional practice, both within their discipline and in teaching and learning. Goulding and Seddon (2010) conclude that, for this potential to be realised in mixed-sector institutions, there is a need to recognise the value and the time it takes to be engaged in these activities and to resolve the challenges that necessarily arise over this new constitution of teachers' work.

To further the perspectives on the nature of scholarly practice in tertiary educational institutions, the narrators of the case studies commissioned for this research were asked to reflect on the institutional and workplace factors that shaped or constrained the way they built up their knowledge. Their reflections contain similar barriers and enablers as those found in the literature. While all three cases comment on time-constraining scholarly work, this problem is revealed most glaringly in the mixed-sector narrative, in which the scholarly practice is undertaken in unpaid time. This may be, partially at least, a manifestation of the institution's conceptualisation of scholarship as activities that can be separated from day-to-day academic work. The embedding of scholarship in daily practice evidenced in the university case is instructive in this respect. That said, the mixed-sector case corroborates the concerns expressed in both the Australian and UK literature about the negative impact of an inappropriate industrial relations framework on the quality of scholarship. This arguably represents

the single most significant constraint on the development and quality of scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector TAFE institutions.

Nevertheless, the relative valuing of scholarly work is not expressed exclusively in terms of the recognition of the time required for scholarship, and the role of senior managers on this point is significant. In all three cases senior management support is cited as a critical enabler of scholarly work. However, the nature of this support varies in each context. In the VET case the senior management role is largely portrayed as an authorising function: championing and 'allowing' the methodology, 'recognising the potential of the knowledge' and vetting the public release of the outcomes. Management's role in facilitating access to internal and external audiences and embedding the outcomes into institute processes may also perhaps be inferred from this case. In the university case, management support is manifested in the form of public confidence in the scholar's role and their recognition of their own need to engage in learning with and from this individual. In the mixed-sector case, management support is expressed as understanding the common challenges of dealing with students, implying a collegial relationship somewhat more akin to the university than the VET portrayal.

A coming together: the practice of scholarship

While the literature clearly establishes the challenges and tensions faced by higher education teachers in mixed-sector providers, external expectations about the relationship between higher education teaching and scholarship also frame the practice of scholarship at these sites. Wheelahan et al. (2009) contend that teachers position themselves within the spaces created by the interaction between sectoral relations, policy frameworks, institutional priorities and cultures, and their habitus. In this section we consider how individual values, institutional settings and externally framed expectations come together in shaping scholarly practice.

Boyer (1990) saw the scholarship of discovery as, not only contributing to new knowledge, but also to the intellectual climate of the institution. He suggests that his model of scholarship presents opportunities for the organisation to clarify its goals and confidently shape its unique purpose and mission within higher education. Extending Boyer's notion of the connection between scholarship and an institution's intellectual climate, Badley cites Schön (1995), who contends that Boyer's new forms of scholarship call for a new institutional epistemology: what he calls 'an epistemology of reflective practice' (Badley 2003, p.305).

The university and the mixed-sector narratives indicate an awareness of the link between the scholarly practices of the narrator and the culture of the institution. In the university case the scholarly work is framed as cultural change, which is as much about changing the thinking of the academics as it is about changing the curriculum. While the mixed-sector text cites the use of problem-based learning to challenge institutional thinking, there is little detail on how this is being achieved or the context of these cultural shifts.

Implicit in the conceptions of scholarship put forward in the literature is some form of academic values. Boyer characterises academic values in terms of the qualities of a scholar, which include:

> Having the capacity for original work, study serious intellectual problems and present their results to colleagues; remaining professionally alive and well informed with one's field [discipline]; being held to the highest standards of integrity; and being carefully assessed and demonstrating to peers that performance standards have been met. (Boyer 1990, pp.27—8)

Badley (2003) proposes ‘freedom, growth, variety, conversation, consensus, knowledge and truth’ (p.308) as academic values and recognises that these may be contested. While drawing heavily on the work of Glassick, Huber and Maeroff’s (1997) work in other areas, he does not emulate their academic values, which emphasise integrity, perseverance and courage. In contrast to the Higher Education Standards Framework, in which higher education providers are required to promote and protect free intellectual inquiry and expression in higher education learning, teaching and research activities, the literature cited addresses the academic values of the individual scholar. Yet values are an important component of institutional culture.

The interplay of personal and institutional values is evident in the VET narrative in particular. This text cites a combination of the organisation’s corporate values and the author’s personally espoused pedagogical values, in which student-centred learning takes a prominent place. The values guiding the scholarly practice portrayed in the mixed-sector narrative are personal: learning through reflective practice and a professional duty of care. The university example describes values related to the subject content, teaching and learning and educational leadership.

The inclusion of corporate values in the VET case reflects a greater sense of the institutional ownership of scholarly work than is evident in the other two narratives. It seems that management vetting of scholarly outputs prior to public release is commonplace in many VET and mixed-sector institutions, which has obvious implications for free intellectual inquiry and runs counter to the sorts of practices deemed typical of a higher education culture. It may be that this is more a function of a lack of confidence on the part of managers in the quality of the scholarship. If so, having agreed and sectorally endorsed standards of scholarship, such as those proposed by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff, may change this practice.

Examples of scholarship across the tertiary sector

The next two sections of the report discuss the outcomes of the forum involving practitioners and other stakeholders across the tertiary sector. In an attempt to capture some of the diversity of scholarly practice in the sector, we asked participants to share examples of different forms of scholarship from their workplaces and to reflect on what makes those practices scholarly. We used Boyer's typology to help identify examples of the scholarships of discovery, integration and application. Details about the examples are limited, given the nature of the data gathering. Nevertheless, the discussion revealed that each of Boyer's four forms of scholarship is practised in each location in the Australian tertiary sector. Because examples of the scholarship of teaching and learning were already richly described in the narratives, we used these to generate discussion about the sectoral similarities and differences in the ways that scholarship is practised.

The scholarship of discovery

While numerous structural, cultural and capability constraints on the scholarship of discovery in VET and mixed-sector institutions were discussed, areas where this form of scholarship can and does flourish were also identified. Arts practice is one such area. Creative activity and performance are explicitly recognised in the definition of research laid out in the national protocols. Music performance in a mixed-sector institution was given as an example. In this example teaching staff regularly perform their original compositions before student audiences. The analysis of the pieces and the processes involved in their composition and performance are then used as a teaching resource. A similar VET example involved making a film, which was also subsequently used in a teaching and learning context.

Representatives from one mixed-sector institution discussed their efforts to contribute to the emerging 'new discipline' of gastronomy. While this has an applied focus in terms of theorising from a practice base, it could well be considered an example of the scholarship of discovery vis-à-vis its input to the establishment of a theoretical knowledge base for the discipline.

The scholarship of integration

One expression of the scholarship of integration in VET and mixed-sector institutions involves multidisciplinary networks and seminars. Such an example is a scholarly network that has been established in Victoria for higher education teachers in VET institutions and VET teachers who are engaged in postgraduate study. Because there is a lack of critical mass of scholars in any one discipline, the focus of this network is scholarship itself. Monthly meetings involve exploring different aspects of scholarly practice, often led by a guest speaker. Members present their scholarly work to one another for review. Because of the multidisciplinary nature of the network, presenters must explain specialist disciplinary content to a generalist audience. In this case peer review necessarily focuses on the processes of scholarship rather than on the disciplinary content. The network is supported by a Moodle site, on which members' papers can be posted for comment, scholarly articles shared and conversation forums conducted.

Another example of the scholarship of integration in a mixed-sector context involved making a radio program that explained a specialist aspect of design to a general audience. The establishment of a study circle, which entailed building an interdisciplinary group whose focus was research and scholarly sharing, was given as an example of the scholarship of integration in a university.

The scholarship of application (engagement)

Applied research was seen as a 'natural fit' for VET and mixed-sector institutions because it builds on existing practices, such as community-based projects, and on already established links with industry. It was noted that applied research needs to be explicit about the benefit it offers to industry and/or the community and needs to focus on solving problems of concern to these stakeholders. An example was given of a mixed-sector institute working with the wine industry to address the issue of changing the sense of taste when teaching wine appreciation to people who are brought up with a sweet palate.

Examples from VET and mixed-sector institutions often drew on these intersections with industry in research and development or innovation projects. One institute cited their work in establishing a furnishing industry design and innovation centre, whereby emerging designers worked with institute staff to prototype their work and link to manufacturers and retailers. Other examples included involvement in product or materials testing and projects aimed at increasing the automotive industry's innovation capacities at one institute's centre of excellence. While forum participants readily identified these examples as forms of knowledge building, there was acknowledgment that this new knowledge was rarely documented beyond publication in trade journals.

In another VET example of the scholarship of application, a technology-rich learning hub for young people with Asperger's syndrome was established as a result of an externally funded research project. The hub brings together young people with Asperger's, technology experts in computer programming and design, and the researchers from a VET-based research centre in a dual-sector university. The research showed that online technologies improved the social skills of these young people by allowing them to learn about social interaction in a safe, mediated and non-confronting environment.

Action research projects, sometimes involving students researching under the supervision of teaching staff, were also cited as examples of the scholarship of application. In some cases this led to the co-publication of student work with the institute. For example, a course leader in one mixed-sector institution obtained a small grant to conduct research with the local refugee/migrant community, with the students undertaking the action research subject within the degree program working on the project as co-researchers.

What features distinguish scholarly practice in each location of the sector?

Taken across the sector as a whole, the findings from the forum are consistent with the literature that we used to inform our analysis of the narratives — and with our conclusions on what quality scholarly practice entails. When the data from the forum are disaggregated by sectoral location, the similarities and differences that emerged also corroborate our analysis of the narratives, while some new features were identified. The data indicate that scholarly practice in VET is:

- action-based and applied
- directed towards the interrogation, improvement and enhancement of practice. This orientation towards continuous improvement is seen as synonymous with 'professionalism', but it was noted

that such a culture of professionalism is not always evident in VET. It was suggested that compliance with corporate quality assurance processes is a driver for good practice in VET, rather than scholarship

- characterised by a lack of knowledge-sharing opportunities within and across VET organisations, which influences the way scholarship is practised
- often peer-reviewed by industry where applied research is undertaken with industry partners.

Distinctive features of scholarly practice in higher education include:

- recognition of the need to situate knowledge building, including critical reflection, in a theoretical framework and an awareness of disciplinary and research traditions
- the interrogation of underlying assumptions about who owns knowledge, peer review and research
- the public articulation of critical reflection
- the need for open and free inquiry
- the conflation of scholarship and research
- a recognition of the way scholarship measurement and resources impact on practice. It was observed that the scholarship of teaching and learning is regarded as a 'second discipline' in higher education and is not recognised as equivalent to discipline-based scholarship, is not necessarily a part of core practice and is not highly valued. This was attributed to the structures for research assessment forcing the separation of teaching from disciplinary research and muting the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning.

The features identified as characteristic of mixed-sector scholarly practice include:

- the prominence of targeting the continuous improvement of teaching and learning practice as the focus of scholarly activity
- an emphasis on the value of industry relevance and industry-based research
- the isolated and highly individualised way in which scholarly work is undertaken
- a recognition of the need to situate scholarly practice within the literature that supports it
- a recognition of the need for critical reflection
- an awareness of the role of identity in shaping understandings and practice. Consistent with the literature findings, the primary affiliation for many higher education teachers in TAFE institutes was reported to reside with their industry vocation rather than their teaching role. Given the short history of higher education provision in TAFE, an additional identity as 'scholar' struggles to find purchase in this context.

The findings from the forum reveal overlap in some of the features of VET and mixed-sector scholarly practice, such as industry focus, the emphasis on the continuous improvement of teaching and learning, and individualised ways of building knowledge. But they also reveal overlap between the distinguishing features of mixed-sector and higher education scholarly practice, such as recognition of the role of critical reflection and of literature in situating scholarly practice within theoretical frameworks and traditions. Thus scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions can be characterised as a hybrid form that reflects the hybrid nature of the institutions in which it is produced.

Criteria for indicating 'quality' in scholarly practice

The forum considered what indicators denote 'quality' in scholarly practice in each location. The discussion was framed by Glassick, Huber and Maeroff's (1997) standards of scholarly work; namely, clear goals, adequate preparation, appropriate methods, significant results, effective presentation and reflective critique. This work was used as a reference point because the standards were derived from sources which incorporated variations in purpose, disciplinary norms and institutional context in considering how to evaluate scholarly work. The authors inferred a significant degree of universality in the application of the standards from the number and diversity of the source documents. However, these sources are North American and we wanted to test the standards' applicability to the emerging Australian tertiary sector context.

The indicators identified by forum participants emphasised different aspects of Glassick and colleagues' standards and the associated sub-questions shown in table 2, but there was nothing in the data that contested the standards themselves or challenged their relevance to the Australian context. Only one of the Glassick standards, 'effective presentation', was not represented in the forum data. While each sector cited 'making knowledge public', all were silent on the effectiveness of the manner of its presentation as an indicator of quality.

The left column of table 3 sets down a list of provisional criteria for indicating quality in scholarly practice derived from the forum responses and framed by the Glassick standards. The criteria that align with those standards are shown first, followed by additional quality indicators that are either missing or not made explicit in the standards. Samples of the forum responses have been selected to illustrate the nuanced understandings in each sectoral location. Despite deliberate selection to highlight these fine distinctions, table 3 shows a remarkable degree of consensus across sectoral locations over what constitutes quality in scholarly practice.

Table 3 Provisional criteria for quality in scholarly practice

Provisional criteria for quality	VET	Mixed-sector	Higher education
Clear goals		▪ Articulating the problem/ question ▪ Clear purpose and planned, structured approach	▪ Setting an agenda with specified activities
Adequate preparation	▪ Supported with resources, funding, time, equipment etc. ▪ Testing knowledge against others' research	▪ Situated in the literature ▪ Research current practice internationally	▪ Is informed by current and past developments in the discipline ▪ Identification of problems with reference to the literature and stakeholders etc.
Appropriate methods	▪ Continual testing and refinement of methodologies	▪ Explicit processes – systematic undertaking ▪ Robust method and academically rigorous	▪ Systematic and planned approach ▪ Rigorous design ▪ Keeping good records of process and outcomes

Provisional criteria for quality	VET	Mixed-sector	Higher education
Significant results	▪ Innovation ▪ Contribution to a broader body of knowledge	▪ Measure outcomes against purpose ▪ New application of technology and/or knowledge	▪ Adding to original research ▪ Can identify application of new knowledge in domains − students, teachers, teaching, scholarly community, policy ▪ Contributes to improved professional practice
Reflective critique	▪ Open for critique/ review/comment/ feedback ▪ Continual improvement ▪ Self-articulated change in perspective	▪ Reflection on outcomes as global citizens ▪ Results impact on future practice: iterative and reflective process	▪ Reflective about processes and agreed outcomes ▪ Makes explicit who they (the scholar) are in the process and what influences and assumptions they bring to the work
Collaboration	▪ Dialogue, comparison and review of change in practice through a community of practice	▪ Engagement with a wide range of stakeholders who contribute to the outcomes ▪ Integrates a range of disciplines to create multidisciplinary ways of doing things	▪ Shared reflection ▪ Drawing on specialist expertise and advice ▪ Multidisciplinary
Making knowledge public	▪ Sharing knowledge with colleagues and stakeholders	▪ Peer review ▪ Record/publish scholarly practice ▪ Sharing work with wider professional community	▪ Peer review/validation ▪ Disseminate through teaching, publishing and discussion with end users
Critical analysis and synthesis	▪ Identifying assumptions ▪ Refinements are made with an underpinning rationale ▪ Evidence-based	▪ Interrogates existing knowledge and traditions ▪ Challenge existing ways of constructing and viewing knowledge in an area of endeavour ▪ Are knowledge claims supported by evidence?	▪ Challenging, contrasting and contesting ideas ▪ Being cognisant of power issues ▪ Stepping back from the problem and making sense of the research outcomes ▪ Synthesis of results and clear conclusions
Ethical practice		▪ Integrates broader social issues e.g. ethics, intellectual practice	▪ Ethical practices
Theory-informed practice		▪ Use of literature so we know what works	▪ Theorising in a conceptual framework

Institutionalising quality standards

Discussion of these indicators of quality scholarly practice suggests a significant degree of consensus across the tertiary education sector about what constitutes ‘quality’ in scholarly practice. There is agreement across stakeholders that introducing a qualitative dimension to the understandings, practices and evaluation of scholarship in Australian tertiary education may be desirable. It could be used at system, institution and individual levels to guide the planning, conduct and evaluation of scholarly work. For example, the incorporation of evaluation criteria of scholarly practice into the new regulatory framework governing higher education provision (still under development at the time of writing) could provide an opportunity for encouraging rich scholarly practice by extending the current conventions that count activities designated as ‘scholarly’. At an institutional level, the adoption of qualitative criteria would clarify scholarly expectations, no matter what form that scholarship may take. They could inform institutional processes of recognition and reward. For individuals, the criteria could guide the planning and conduct of scholarly work, as well as the processes of reflective critique and peer review.

The adoption of such a qualitative framework has significant implications for mixed-sector institutions in relation to:

- *Staff training*: a PhD is the generally accepted qualification for newly recruited university staff, which means all are research-trained and licensed. This is not the case for higher education teachers in mixed-sector institutions. The gap between the capabilities implicit in the indicators of quality and the minimal qualifications required for VET teaching poses further challenges for developing skills in scholarship.
- *Ways of working*: across all sectoral locations the public dimension of knowledge building is acknowledged as an indicator of quality. This understanding that scholarship builds shared public resources has implications for the ways of working in VET and in mixed-sector institutions, where scholarship has been seen as a largely individual endeavour. A highly casualised workforce across the tertiary sector produces additional challenges for finding shared time.
- *Enhancing management leadership and support*: champions of scholarly practice have been identified as a critical component underpinning scholarly culture in all sectoral locations. Making expectations that recognise the qualitative dimensions of scholarly work explicit clarifies what is involved in undertaking quality scholarly practice. The literature suggests that to date this dimension has not been fully appreciated in mixed-sector institutions.
- *Funding arrangements*: resource allocations that endorse scholarly practice as an official requirement of work in tertiary education assist in making quality scholarly practice feasible. Extending Commonwealth Supported Places to students studying higher education courses in mixed-sector institutions was also suggested.

Strategies for enhancing scholarly practice and culture

The forum participants were consulted about practical strategies that could support, enhance and further develop quality scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions. While limited in detail, some specific models and general strategies emerged from the discussion.

One dual-sector university of around 60 000 students, divided more or less equally between VET and higher education, is developing a unified approach to tertiary education and is using the scholarship of tertiary learning and teaching as the main driving force for achieving this. There are several elements to this strategy:

- *Curriculum renewal*: this involves the design of a model of continuous tertiary curriculum for higher-level VET and higher education qualifications that share a distinctive approach to supporting excellent outcomes for students. Curriculum renewal is the vehicle that prompts staff to consider what the scholarship of tertiary learning and teaching means in the university. Around 500 staff have participated in one way or another, including via a website, forums, meetings and blogs.
- *A new teaching and learning portfolio*: the role of this 30-strong team is to work strategically and deliberately across the institution to encourage the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- *An integrated suite of formal teaching qualifications*: the current qualifications in teaching in the tertiary sector are being rationalised and revolutionised to culminate in one Graduate Certificate in Tertiary Teaching for all incoming VET and higher education teachers. This is supplemented by a bridging program for existing teachers without a degree.
- *A strong informal approach to building scholarly culture* through the scholarship of tertiary learning and teaching.

A model such as that pioneered for the purpose of academic recognition in the visual and performing arts was suggested as a possible exemplar for supporting scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions. As already mentioned, creating or performing a new work is recognised as research in this field, but a brief exegesis that provides critical insight into its development or performance is required for academic recognition. This model acknowledges the inappropriateness of a conventional thesis for artists because it disconnects them from their core practice of creating and performing. The relevance of this model to mixed-sector institutions lies in the analogy between creative work and good practice in teaching and learning or professional practice. The existing strengths for which mixed-sector institutions are recognised are applied learning and links with industry. It was suggested that these — or any other area of existing practice — could form the basis of the scholarship, with an exegesis-like reflective commentary providing critical insights that demonstrate how the practice is scholarly. This model affirms and strengthens the scholarly aspect of day-to-day practice and also documents good practice: it transforms good practice into scholarly practice.

However, the character of the accompanying documentation needed to 'convert' a creative work or professional practice into research or scholarship is debated. There was significant deliberation at the forum about the distinction between professional and scholarly practice. This reflects the ongoing debate in Australia and internationally in the creative arts and other practice-based fields — such as nursing — over what distinguishes good professional practice from scholarly practice and what

constitutes ‘new knowledge’ in practice-based and practice-led research. These issues are explored more in appendix B.

Another initiative for supporting and enhancing scholarly practice is the Community of Practice Scholarships for VET practitioners funded by the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER). In this model, around ten VET teachers per year who are inexperienced in research investigate a ‘burning issue’ in their organisation. They are given a small grant, attend workshops to build their research skills and are provided with a mentor from the ranks of the Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association (AVETRA). The intent is to enable novice researchers to undertake their own small research project over a year within a community of practice facilitated by Victoria University. Although the program does not stipulate research into teaching and learning, it is the predominant focus — in line with the tendency, already noted, in VET to concentrate on the scholarship of teaching and learning over other disciplinary areas. Approximately 30 participants had been through the program at the time of reporting, some of whom have gone on to undertake higher-level qualifications. Others have gone back into their organisations with an insight into the role of critical reflection as a useful tool and an understanding of the value of providing an evidence base for their practice, while some are involved in research teams with university colleagues. The overarching aims of the program are to make rudimentary research training more accessible and to encourage employers to see the benefits of enhancing scholarly practice.

Other more general strategies were also put forward at the forum. The discussion was framed in terms of the six areas identified from the literature as warranting a particular focus: enhancing understanding about what it means to construct a scholarly culture, building institutional capacity for scholarship and a scholarly culture, building workforce expertise, establishing spaces for sharing scholarly work, addressing the terms and conditions of employment, and working with industry and other external agencies to build collaborative scholarly partnerships.

Enhancing understanding about what it means to construct a scholarly culture

Developing a common language with which to generate organisation-wide dialogue and shared understandings was seen as key. Some of the ways by which this could be achieved included developing a glossary of terms and placing this on the organisation’s intranet; initiating discussions via websites, blogs, forums and real and virtual meetings; and having curriculum development staff facilitate conversations as they work with departmental staff across the institution on course development and renewal.

Cultivating an environment that acknowledges scholarship as a valued staff attribute and creating the necessity for scholarly work — and the sharing of that experience — were also seen as critical to developing a scholarly culture. Some of the ways by which this could be achieved include developing incentives that identify the interests of staff; rewarding scholarly activity and promoting its non-monetary benefits; putting in place open and explicit management support, resourcing and structures to underpin scholarly work, including offering support for staff to undertake higher degrees; and redesigning ways of working to create space for scholarly activity.

Developing knowledge-sharing events for all staff (including managers) and students was suggested as another way of generating shared understanding of, and participation in, scholarly culture. Such events might include seminars with visiting scholars, research networks and other mechanisms for sharing research and discussion arising from engagement with literature. Another suggestion was to

develop multiple points of access to allow different levels of involvement as a way of introducing and demonstrating different forms of scholarly activity; for example, activities ranging from informal conversations, to study circles, to seminars, to inviting guest speakers etc., in which people can participate as the audience, presenters, peer reviewers and so on.

Building institutional capacity for scholarship and scholarly culture

An audit of current capacity was suggested as a starting point, with the recognition of existing scholarly effort becoming the baseline from which to begin asking questions about why, where and how scholarship can be enhanced. This should be linked to long-term goals that specify what the organisation aims to achieve.

The development of appropriate leadership, management and governance structures to support scholarly activity was identified as crucial in building institutional capacity. Scholarly champions who were both committed and influential in institutional leadership were important in encouraging institutional leadership and managers' ownership of scholarly activity. Appropriate academic and governance structures also need to be in place, including performance management strategies and, importantly, an ethics review panel. It was highlighted that the ethics implications for both individuals and institutions must be considered to ensure individuals and others are not exposed once scholarly work is made visible.

Formalising and documenting scholarly activity with mechanisms for capturing reflective practice; for example, journals, blogs, online forums, newsletter articles etc., were also identified as important capacity-building components, not only for the purpose of disseminating knowledge, but also for citing as evidence of satisfying regulatory compliance.

Building workforce expertise

It was emphasised that staff in TAFE institutes cannot be expected to undertake scholarship without training. As already occurs, mixed-sector institutions can use formal postgraduate qualifications as a way of building research expertise and this requires support from senior leadership. But it was acknowledged that this cannot be achieved quickly and needs to be supplemented with less formal strategies, such as mentoring, participation in communities of practice and in lunchtime 'brown bag seminars', visiting scholars and other knowledge-sharing events. The significant development of scholarly skills currently occurs through curriculum development processes. Professional development frameworks and continuing professional development were advocated as a systematic and coherent approach to developing skills in scholarship, examples being workshops on qualitative research methods and academic writing and funding new staff to attend conferences to introduce them to the discipline's academic community.

Establishing spaces for sharing scholarly work

The construction of scholarly spaces within normal day-to-day practice was seen as the key to embedding knowledge sharing in the culture. In one example, existing departmental meetings, by the transfer of communication about administrative and other matters to a weekly bulletin, were freed up exclusively for scholarly discussion. The establishment of this as a long-term strategy was contingent on staff reading and responding to the bulletin in a timely manner.

Other suggestions included establishing a mechanism for identifying people who want to share their experience as scholarly practitioners, including workable protocols for sharing; establishing a register

of available expertise and resources to support scholarly practice; creating a blend of real and virtual spaces to support the dissemination of experience and perspectives; and developing a plain English glossary of terms to support collaboration and sharing of practice. A need for social spaces for informal sharing was also identified.

Addressing the terms and conditions under which scholarly work is produced

Two key factors were identified as severely constraining the time available for scholarly work. The first is the high proportion of casual staff in all locations of the sector, but reportedly in some TAFE institutes as high as fifty per cent. The second factor is teachers delivering higher education programs under TAFE award conditions, which require heavy teaching and administrative loads. Some institutes have attempted to address this by implementing separate awards for VET and higher education teachers. Others have made more or less informal modifications to VET teaching conditions to accommodate scholarly work, while in others teachers undertake some or all of their scholarship in unpaid time. Some institutes that differentiate work conditions for VET and higher education staff reported discontent amongst VET staff about a lighter teaching load for those delivering higher education courses. However, there was consensus on the need for flexibility in working conditions to accommodate different levels of teaching, scholarship and research in a diverse workforce.

Building accountability for scholarship into work requirements was seen as crucial, but questions remain as to how it might be appropriately measured.

Working with industry and other external agencies to build collaborative scholarly partnerships

Applied research with the clear purpose of addressing the problems that industry wants solved was seen as an area for scholarly growth and development. Inviting industry personnel as residents into educational institutions to work collaboratively on research and establishing the practicum as a significant component of degrees were seen as ways to strengthen industry links within a scholarly framework.

Partnerships with universities were also discussed, particularly in relation to bringing in research expertise to mentor new researchers in mixed-sector institutions. Participating in scholarly networks, capitalising on universities' visiting scholars through a small contribution to costs, and attending seminars hosted by partner universities were suggested as further ways of building scholarly capacity through external partnerships.

Mutually beneficial partnerships were proposed as a mechanism for providing the framework, budget, time and commitment to building research capacity in mixed-sector institutions. For example, applications for Australian Research Council Linkage Grants have been successful with TAFE institutes as industry partners. However, success in building capacity in this area was seen to require a strategic and systematic plan and approach.

Discussion and conclusions

This project examined the nature of scholarly practice in three different tertiary education settings to better understand the established patterns and emerging practices of knowledge building. It was prompted by the growing significance of the global knowledge economy and the importance of Australian tertiary education in enhancing the capacities of worker-citizens to learn, problem-solve and innovate across their working lives. The project investigated the way processes of knowledge building are developing, as mixed-sector institutions emerge as an integral part of Australia's tertiary education system.

We found that the concept of 'scholarly practice' provided a helpful practice-based approach for understanding long-standing definitional divisions between 'research' and 'scholarship'. Recognising the way that the work of building knowledge is embedded in different communities and their contexts made it possible to acknowledge the distinctiveness of knowledge produced in higher education, VET and mixed-sector tertiary education settings. The similarities and differences between these settings were linked to institutional traditions of scholarly practice, whereby their own codes of good practice had been developed. The character of these patterns of scholarly practice was affected by the terms and conditions of this intellectual work, practitioners' skills in knowledge building and the nature of their relationships with other communities.

Three features distinguish scholarly practice:

- Scholarly practice is a form of intellectual-practical work, a practice of working in ways that move iteratively between ideas and practical activities, which occurs in tangible workplaces where specific terms and conditions, and purposes and expectations, prevail.
- The knowledge produced through scholarly practice is influenced by the way that work is done and the context in which it is located. It is the scholarly character of that work which defines 'quality scholarly practice' and produces quality knowledge.
- The quality of scholarly practice and the knowledge resources produced are enhanced when the processes and products of knowledge building are open to public scrutiny and dialogue and formalised processes of review and refinement.

Scholarly practice involves:

- a set of procedures, which discipline the process and outcomes of building knowledge and communication of that practice and its scholarly character
- individualised reflective practice, which entails systematic inquiry and engagement with the world and the ways of capturing, representing and communicating about that world and which produces knowledge resources
- processes of knowledge sharing, so that those knowledge resources are open to public scrutiny and refinement and become available for use as endorsed inputs to further scholarly practice.

The forms and practices of knowledge building in Australian tertiary education offer different models of knowledge building, with the capacity to support learning, problem-solving and innovation.

- Scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions reflects the hybrid nature of these institutions, in that it shares some distinguishing features with VET (such as an applied orientation and an emphasis on industry focus and the scholarship of teaching and learning) and some with higher

education (including a recognition of the role of critical reflection, the need to situate scholarly practice within the literature and within a theoretical framework, and the need to integrate broader social and ethical issues). This results in scholarly practice in mixed-sector contexts manifesting a distinctive identity, different from either VET or higher education.

- Some of the features that currently characterise scholarly practice in VET and mixed-sector institutions, such as the isolated and individualised way in which knowledge is built, are a reflection of the institutional constraints that shape the way scholarship is practised, rather than being an expression of a preferred embodiment of scholarship. Such conventions are acknowledged within these locations to be inconsistent with agreed notions of quality scholarly practice.
- Although common terminology may be used across the sector, there is still work to be done in clarifying the language and concepts associated with scholarship and scholarly practice. For instance, there was considerable debate at the forum about what is meant by 'making knowledge public' and 'peer review'. Some views expressed in VET and mixed-sector discussions implied that sharing the outcomes of one's scholarly activities with immediate colleagues fulfils these requirements, but this does not align with understandings of the terms in the higher education sector. As was evident from the higher education narrative, each step in the process is widely discussed; it is not only the outcomes that are shared. The knowledge is developed through conversation with peers, through the literature and through critical reflection in communities of scholars. 'Peer review' is normally understood to involve a double-blind process, in which neither scholar nor reviewer knows the identity of the other. It is only after this that the work is published, and subjected to further scrutiny and debate within a larger community of scholars and general audiences.

Despite this diversity in models of knowledge building across tertiary education settings, there was significant consensus about the quality of scholarly practice. This appears to indicate that, regardless of differences in the ways knowledge building is understood and practised in the different locations, relatively common standards may be applied for the evaluation of all forms of scholarship across the sector. The establishment of standards offers a way of making judgments about the quality of different knowledge resources across Australian tertiary education. It also provides a basis for improving the quality of scholarly practices across higher education, VET and mixed-sector institutions such that the knowledge resources available through tertiary education are enhanced and the skills in working with knowledge that underpin learning, problem-solving and innovation are consolidated.

This project has begun to identify the standards and conventions whose application has the potential to enhance scholarly practice and advance knowledge building across Australian tertiary education. Further investigation is warranted to confirm and elaborate on these, which includes:

- *Indicators of quality scholarly practice*, which can be used for evaluating scholarly work and also guide its planning and conduct. They are resources that may be usefully employed at system, institution and individual levels.
- *Generalisation of skills in quality scholarly practice* across all sectors of Australian tertiary education, which has particular significance for VET and mixed-sector institutions, in terms of training needs and ways of working.
- *Capacity building in management leadership and support*, which plays a critical role in enabling scholarship in all locations of the tertiary sector and without which it cannot thrive.
- *Resource allocations* that address the feasibility of scholarly practice, which is expected to support delivery of higher education courses in mixed-sector institutions.

In addition to these general resources, the project has identified specific practical strategies for mixed-sector institutions which support and enhance quality scholarly practice and culture. Key strategies include:

- initiating organisation-wide real and virtual conversations between all levels of staff to generate a common language, understandings and expectations about quality scholarly practice and its role in the long-term goals of the institution
- ensuring that appropriate governance structures, such as an ethics review committee, are in place to support quality scholarly practice
- building on existing practice in ways that both enhance the scholarly quality of that practice and produce a scholarly outcome in terms of knowledge that can be shared, refined and built upon. An exegesis-style reflective commentary is one mechanism for achieving this
- using a combination of formal qualifications, continuing professional development and informal mechanisms to address the short- and long-term development of skills in knowledge building
- repurposing existing shared time to capitalise on opportunities for scholarly discourse and knowledge sharing and reconfiguring individualised ways of working to create more flexible opportunities for scholarly collaboration
- scaffolding existing links with industry and the community with a scholarly framework and strengthening participation in university networks and other collaborative and knowledge-sharing activities.

Undertaking this research has also drawn attention to the need for further research. Ideas for further research are presented in appendix C.

The research highlights the potential opportunities that mixed-sector and VET institutions have to shape support for scholarship so that it meets the needs and interests of their staff, students and stakeholders, without necessarily imitating what they perceive takes place in a university. While there is much to be done to improve the quality of scholarly practice in VET and mixed-sector institutions, Australia's knowledge culture and innovation capacity will be enhanced if the scholarly contributions made by these institutions are strengthened.

References

Arts and Humanities Research Council 2012, *Research funding guide*, Arts and Humanities Research Council, UK, viewed 28 July 2012, <www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Documents/Research%20Funding%20Guide.pdf>.

Australian Research Council 2010, *Excellence in research for Australia 2010 national report*, ARC, Canberra.

——2011, *Excellence in research for Australia: 2010 national report*, ARC, viewed 25 May 2012, <www.arc.gov.au/era/era_2010/outcomes_2010.htm>.

Australian Universities Quality Agency 2009a, *Report of an audit of Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE (higher education)*, AUQA, viewed 2 May 2011, <www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_nmit_2009.pdf>.

——2009b, *Report of an audit of the Gordon Institute of TAFE (higher education)*, AUQA, viewed 2 May 2011, <www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_gordon_2009.pdf>.

——2010, *Report of an Audit of Box Hill Institute (higher education)*, AQUA, viewed 2 May 2011, <www.auqa.edu.au/files/reports/auditreport_boxhill_2010.pdf>.

Badley, G 2003, 'Improving the scholarship of teaching and learning', *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, vol.40, no.3, pp.303—10.

Boyer, EL 1990, *Scholarship reconsidered: priorities of the professoriate*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.

Brabazon, T & Dagli, Z 2010, 'Putting the doctorate into practice, and the practice into doctorates: creating a new space for quality scholarship through creativity', *Nebula*, no.1/2, p.23.

Bradley, D, Noonan, P, Nugent, H & Scales, B 2008, *Review of Australian higher education: final report*, DEEWR, Canberra.

Brew, A 2003, 'Teaching and research: new relationships and their implications for inquiry-based teaching and learning in higher education', *Higher Education Research & Development*, vol.22, no.1, pp.3—18.

——2010, 'Transforming academic practice through scholarship', *International Journal for Academic Development*, vol.15, no.2, pp.105—16.

Connell, RW 1983, *Intellectuals and intellectual work: which way is up?* , Allen and Unwin, Sydney.

——2007, *Southern theory: the global dynamics of knowledge in social science*, Polity, Cambridge.

Cutler, T 2008, *Venturous Australia: review of the national innovation system*, Cutler and Company, Melbourne.

Diamond, RM 2002, 'Defining scholarship for the twenty-first century', *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol.90, pp.73—9.

Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education 2011, *Higher education standards framework: version 1, December 2011*, DIISRTE, viewed 27 January 2012, <www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/F2012L00003/Download>.

Gibbons, M, Limoges, C, Nowotny, H, Schwartzman, S, Scott, P & Trow, M 1994, *The new production of knowledge: the dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies*, Sage, London.

Glassick, CE, Huber, ME & Maeroff, GI 1997, *Scholarship assessed: evaluation of the professoriate*, Jossey-Bass, San Fransisco.

Goulding, F & Seddon, T 2011, 'Scholarship as emergent labour: higher education teachers in TAFE and the making of scholarship', paper presented to 14th Annual Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association Conference, Melbourne, 28 April 2011.

Kelly, A, Wheelahan, L & Billet, S 2009, 'Betwixt and between: higher education teachers in TAFE', paper presented to 12th Annual Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association Conference, Sydney.

Kemmis, S 2005, 'Knowing practice: searching for saliences', *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, vol.13, no.3, pp.391—425.

Levin, JS 2003, 'Organizational paradigm shift and the university colleges of British Columbia', *Higher Education*, vol.46, no.4, pp.447—67.

——2004, 'The community college as a baccalaureate-granting institution', *The Review of Higher Education*, vol.28, no.1, pp.1—22.

Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007a, *National protocols for higher education approval processes*, MCEETYA, viewed 2 May 2011, <www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/_resources/NationalProtocolsOct2007_Complete.pdf>.

Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs 2007b, *National guidelines for higher education approval processes: guidelines for the registration of non self-accrediting higher education institutions and the accreditation of their courses (relating to National Protocols A and B)*, MCEETYA, viewed 25 October 2011, <hwww.deewr.gov.au/HigherEducation/Programs/StudentSupport/NationalProtocolsforHEApprovalProcesses/Documents/NationalGuidelinesOct2007_AandB.pdf>.

Moodie, G 2010, *Mixed-sector tertiary education: implications for self-accrediting and other higher education institutions*, NCVER, viewed 17 January 2012, <www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2331.html>.

——2012, *Research overview: mixed sector tertiary education*, viewed 7 February 2013, <www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2468.html>.

Moodie, G, Wheelahan, L, Billet, S & Kelly, A 2009, *Higher education in TAFE: an issues paper*, NCVER, Adelaide.

Moodie, G, Wheelahan, L, Curtin, E, Arkoudis, S & Bexley, E 2011, 'VET in higher education: rethought pathways, pedagogy or pragmatism?', paper presented to Australian Vocational Education and Training Research Association 14th Annual Conference, Melbourne, 28 April 2011.

Mottram, J & Rust, C 2009, 'The pedestal and the pendulum: fine art practice, research and doctorates', *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, vol.7, no.2, pp.133—51.

Pardy, J & Seddon, T 2011, 'Making space for VET learning after the Bradley Review: rethinking knowledge to support inclusion and equity', *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol.41, no.1, pp.53—65.

Parry, G 2009, 'Higher education, further education and the English experiment', *Higher Education Quarterly*, vol.63, no.4, pp.322—42.

Parry, G, Davies, P & Williams, J 2004, *Difference, diversity and distinctiveness: higher education in the learning and skills sector*, 2nd edn, Learning and Skills Development Agency, London.

Paulsen, MB & Feldman, KA 1995, 'Towards a reconceptualization of scholarship: a human action system with functional imperatives', *Journal of Higher Education*, vol.66, no.6, pp.615—40.

Productivity Commission 2011, *Vocational education and training workforce*, Productivity Commission, viewed 25 May 2012, <www.pc.gov.au/projects/study/education-workforce/vocational>.

Rice, RE 2002, 'Beyond scholarship reconsidered: toward an enlarged vision of the scholarly work of faculty members', *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, vol.90, pp.7—17.

Schon, DA 1983, *The reflective practitioner*, Maurice, Temple, Smith Ltd, London.

——1995, 'The new scholarship requires a new epistemology', *Change*, November/December, pp.27—34.

Seddon, T 2010, 'Doctoral education in global times: "scholarly quality" as practical ethics in research', in M Walker & P Thomson (eds), *The Routledge doctoral supervisor's companion: supporting effective research in education and the social sciences*, Routledge, London, pp.508—53.

Seddon, T & Malley, J 1998, *A staff development strategy for supporting research priorities in the State Training Service*, Office of Training and Further Education, Melbourne.

Turner, R, McKenzie, L & Stone, M 2009, '"Square peg — round hole": the emerging professional identities of HE in FE lecturers in a partner college network in south-west England', *Research in Post Compulsory Education*, vol.14, no.4, pp.355—68.

Turner, R, McKenzie, LM, McDermott, AP & Stone, M 2009, 'Emerging HE cultures: perspectives from CETL award holders in a partner college network', *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, vol.33, no.3, pp.255—63.

Wheelahan, L, Moodie, G, Billet, S & Kelly, A 2009, *Higher education in TAFE*, NCVER, Adelaide.

Wheelahan, L, Arkoudis, S, Moodie, G, Fredman, N & Bexley, E 2012, *Shaken not stirred? The development of one tertiary education sector in Australia*, NCVER, Adelaide.

Young, P 2002, '"Scholarship is the word that dare not speak its name": lecturers' experiences of teaching on a higher education program in a further education college', *Journal of Further & Higher Education*, vol.26, no.3, pp.273—86.

Appendix A – Limitations of the research

This project was small scale and limited in scope. Its research design provides insights into the nature of scholarly practice in Australian tertiary education, but these indicative findings warrant further research to confirm and establish their generality.

The style of research used in this project reflects the limited data available on knowledge building and scholarly practice in Australia's tertiary education sector. While initiatives like Excellence for Research in Australia (ERA) are beginning to provide systematic data relating to university scholarly practices, there is very little work on knowledge building, scholarship and research in VET and mixed-sector providers. The limitations in the existing data make the design of large-scale quantitative surveys difficult and justify qualitative research approaches. More detailed case studies would have further clarified the issues that are important in scholarly practice and the work of developing a scholarly culture across tertiary education.

The methodological constraints mean that it was not possible to assemble representative data related to scholarly practice in different sectoral locations. Our use of specific examples limits the possibility of generalising from this study, but the stakeholder forum provided a strategy for scaling up the project to extend and validate these understandings.

Consultations at the forum provided confirmation of project findings but only limited information about the forms of scholarly practice undertaken in each sectoral location. Similarly, the criteria for defining 'quality scholarly practice' and the strategies for supporting and enhancing scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions proposed at the forum are preliminary and require further investigation and validation.

Finally, this study focused solely on public tertiary institutions; little is known about scholarly practice in private providers.

Appendix B – Professional versus scholarly practice

Research governance and accountability frameworks offer resources for considering models of scholarly practice and processes of recognising scholarship that builds knowledge. For example, to be recognised as research output in Australia, creative works must be accompanied by a statement demonstrating 'coherent research content' (Australian Research Council 2010, p.205), while the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council (2012) funding guidelines state that 'creative output can be produced, or practice undertaken, as an integral part of a research process' and expects that creative output or practice 'be accompanied by some form of documentation of the research process, as well as some form of textual analysis or explanation to support its position and as a record of … critical reflection' (p.71). Both these approaches presuppose that the professional practice is embedded in a research process.

Developments in doctoral education since the 1990s extend these resources. Research on doctoral education offers insights into different models of scholarly practice, processes of recognising scholarship that builds knowledge, and the resources and teaching-supervision practices that build professionals' capacities for scholarly work (Seddon 2010). The relationship between professional and scholarly practice is debated. For example, Brabazon and Dagli (2010) make the point that professional practice is the *basis* for the research, not the research itself. Mottram and Rust (2009, p.35) make this distinction clear in their critique of the notion of 'practice as research', as it is understood in the performance field:

> The extent to which practice might be seen as a method for research also needs to be viewed with caution. Practice may provide, for example, a location or focus upon which to direct questions, or it can also be a means of generating data, a site for testing propositions, for engaging individuals and communities, or for reflecting on theories and methods. However practice is generally used in combination with other tools of enquiry. Practice is an activity that can be employed in research, but the method or methodology must always include an explicit understanding of how and to what extent the practice contributes to the enquiry.

These debates draw out the significance of context in the processes of knowledge building. While this doctoral education literature largely focused on university contexts, it has encouraged wider research that highlights the way that the histories and cultures of social, national and institutional settings support different processes of knowledge building, incubating distinct knowledge claims and knowledge forms (Connell 2007). Such research offers a way of investigating knowledge ecologies, which rest on relationships between everyday practice, scholarship and research as processes of knowledge building, and the way new knowledge is recognised and authorised. It offers insights into the strengths and challenges associated with scholarly practice across tertiary education and in partnership spaces that are formed, as university, VET and mixed-sector providers reach into different domains of Australian society, economy and culture. These insights offer ways of better understanding tertiary education's knowledge ecologies and could significantly enhance scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions.

Appendix C – Areas for further research

This small-scale project has established a platform for further research on scholarly practice in Australian tertiary education and, particularly, in the emergent space of mixed-sector providers. Its findings suggest that further research on three key issues is warranted.

1 *Scholarly practices that support different forms of scholarship*: Boyer's four forms of scholarship appear to provide a useful classification of scholarly practice in Australian tertiary education. However, the different social, organisational and cultural histories of universities, VET and mixed-sector institutions mean that the scholarship of teaching, engagement, synthesis and discovery involves different forms and ways of using words in doing and representing scholarly practice. Investigating the similarities and differences in scholarly practice related to engagement, integration and discovery across the three tertiary settings will confirm the validity of Boyer's classification and reveal the distinctive contribution that universities, VET and mixed-sector private providers make to public knowledge building in Australia.

2 *The resources required to support scholarly practice and build scholarly cultures*: the current project suggests that key resources and organisational developments enhance scholarly practice. Understanding the relative significance of these resources and strategies will enhance knowledge building and, hence, more effective capability development in mixed-sector public providers. The key resources and strategies suggested by this project include:

- indicators of scholarly practice, which may be used as a common benchmark for evaluating scholarly work across Australian tertiary education
- the generalisation of skills and understandings about the nature and significance of quality scholarly practice across the tertiary sector
- capacity building in management leadership and support, which is critical to enabling scholarship in all locations of the tertiary sector
- resource allocations that address the feasibility of scholarly practice, which is expected to support the delivery of higher education qualifications in mixed-sector institutions.

Case study research would show how these four key resources are best embedded in practical strategies for supporting and enhancing scholarly practice and culture in mixed-sector institutions. These strategies include: ensuring shared understandings and expectations of scholarship and scholarly practice across all levels of the institution; establishing appropriate governance structures to support quality scholarly practice; building on and documenting existing practice so that its scholarly quality is enhanced and the knowledge that is generated can be shared, refined and built upon; using a range of formal and informal mechanisms to develop skills in knowledge building; reconfiguring ways of working to enable flexible opportunities for knowledge sharing and scholarly collaboration; and scaffolding industry and community engagement with a scholarly framework that generates resources for public dissemination.

3 *Australia's knowledge ecologies and their economic, social and cultural contributions*: the post-Bradley tertiary education system brings together different models of knowledge building. The knowledge produced by universities, VET and mixed-sector institutions has been incubated in

different ways as a result of the historical development of scholarly practice in these tertiary settings, each of which reaches into different domains of Australian society, economy and culture. Recent initiatives, such as Excellence of Research in Australia (ERA) and associated projects (for example, AARE-ACDE Strategic Capacity Building for Australian Education Research) provide data that can be used to understand university knowledge ecologies.

Such research establishes a platform for investigating the VET and mixed-sector knowledge ecologies and has the capacity to inform institution building. For example, despite the identified strength of industry and community links in VET and mixed-sector institutions, the lack of scholarly publication means that little is known about the knowledge resources produced in these tertiary education settings. This raises further questions, such as: How do community-based projects differ from industry projects? How are the research problems and methodologies constructed and how are the benefits measured? How are the interests of stakeholders considered in relation to the interests of the public? How is knowledge built from professional practice and how are the knowledge claims justified?

Research such as this could provide insights into the three distinct tertiary education knowledge ecologies and their separate and shared contributions to Australian society, economy and culture.

Support document details

Additional information relating to this research is available in *Towards a culture of scholarly practice in mixed-sector institutions: support document*. It can be accessed from NCVER's website http://www.ncver.edu.au/publications/2599.html> and includes Instructions to narrative writers and three examples of scholarly practice.

NVETR Program funding

This work has been produced by NCVER under the National Vocational Education and Training Research (NVETR) Program, which is coordinated and managed by NCVER on behalf of the Australian Government and state and territory governments. Funding is provided through the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education.

The NVETR Program is based on national research priorities approved by ministers with responsibility for vocational education and training.

The author/project team was funded to undertake this research via a grant under the NVETR Program. The research grants are awarded to organisations through a competitive process, in which NCVER does not participate. To ensure the quality and relevance of the research, projects are selected using an independent and transparent process and research reports are peer-reviewed.

The NVETR Program aims to improve policy and practice in the VET sector. The research effort itself is collaborative and requires strong relationships with the research community in Australia's universities and beyond. NCVER may also involve various stakeholders, including state and territory governments, industry and practitioners, to inform the commissioned research and using a variety of mechanisms such as project roundtables and forums.

For further information about the program go to the NCVER website <www.ncver.edu.au>.

National Centre for Vocational Education Research Ltd
Level 11, 33 King William Street, Adelaide, South Australia
PO Box 8288, Station Arcade, SA 5000 Australia
Telephone +61 8 8230 8400 Facsimile +61 8 8212 3436
Website www.ncver.edu.au Email ncver@ncver.edu.au