

The Teaching Fellowship Scheme

Mike Keppell, Natasha Hard and Betsy Lyon

Please cite as:

Keppell, M., Hard, N. & Lyon, B. (2012). The Teaching Fellowship Scheme. In Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012). *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning* (Appendix D – Case Studies). DEHub.

Background

This case explores the development and evolution the Teaching Fellowship Scheme (TFS) run by the Flexible Learning Institute at Charles Sturt University (CSU) between 2008 and 2012. As a major distance provider in Australia, CSU had historically relied upon a traditional print-based mode of delivering distance education. However, in response to the changing face of higher education, the university recognised the need to transform practice in distance and blended and flexible learning and teaching in order to provide equitable options for their diverse range of students (Keppell, O'Dwyer, Lyon, & Childs, 2010). In fact, Dolence and Norris (1995) argued that to survive this transition, organisations would be required to transform from being structured and process driven to “fast, flexible and fluid” (p.31).

Set against this backdrop, discussions about developing an Institute for Innovation in Flexible Learning and Teaching commenced in 2006, with the Flexible Learning Institute (FLI) established in 2007. The institute was funded through the office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and had critical support of senior management (Scott, 2004). The institute was designed to enhance the quality of learning and teaching through overseeing, developing and fostering excellence and innovation in flexible and blended learning. This would be achieved through pedagogical scholarship, the promotion of good practice and policy advice.

One of the key projects developed by the FLI was the Teaching Fellowship Scheme (TFS). The Scheme was developed in response to a changing educational context characterised by the commercialisation and globalisation of education, increasing numbers and diversity of students, changes in student expectations and an increased focus on accountability (Scott, Coates, & Anderson, 2008; Oblinger & Oblinger, 2005). The Teaching Fellowship Scheme was initially inspired by a previous development based research project undertaken by the Director of the FLI at the Centre for Learning, Teaching and Technology at the Hong Kong Institute of Education (Reeves, 2000, p. 7).

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

This case study examines the FLI Fellowships conducted since July 2008 when the first eight Fellows were accepted into the program.

Visions & Initial Targets

The FLI was originally developed to promote innovation, transform educational practice in flexible and blended learning and teaching, foster research-based teaching and develop applied research outputs relevant to innovation and assist in addressing priority educational issues linked to these objectives (Keppell et al., 2010). The review of curriculum and learning development, course and subject redesign and the development and evaluation of learning tools/strategies and management programs were all considered important areas to address. Building on these foci of the FLI, and the CSU strategies around the transformation of learning and teaching, the Scheme was intended to encourage Fellows to engage in projects relevant to their practice, and with a focus on professional development and reflection, promoting authentic and transformative learning.

The scheme aimed to transform learning and teaching by working with individual academics from across all disciplines, to adopt a more blended and flexible approach. The design of the Fellowship Scheme was also intended to provide significant benefits to the Fellows in terms of career development, given the enhanced opportunity for research output and for a discipline specific investment in the scholarship of teaching and learning. Designed to align with the work by Lefoe, Parrish, Hart, Smigiel, and Pannan (2008) in developing the Leadership Capacity Development Framework (LCDF), the scheme supported Fellows through mentoring, providing opportunities to present and publish work, increased academic recognition, and the development of a community of practice centred on blended and flexible practice.

The Scheme sought to position the Fellows as change agents able to initiate pedagogical change within their disciplines through providing examples of good practice and involving other staff in their projects. By keeping Fellows as active members within their schools, the Scheme hoped to facilitate organisational transformation as an “organizational learning process extends incrementally across all levels of the organization, from the individual staff member to groups” (Roche, 2001, p. 121). This distributed model also intended to influence the change process at CSU based on the assumption that this process would provide a natural accrual of benefit to schools, faculties and the university. As such, the Scheme sought to include Fellows from all 26 schools at the university.

The facilitation of collaborative professional relationships between the Flexible Learning Institute and various schools and faculties was also a critical component of the Scheme’s design. The developers of the scheme envisioned it as a “powerful conduit for the sharing of knowledge, skills and information within and between schools and an enabling strategy for the

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

development of communities of practice across the university as a whole” (Keppell et al., 2010, p. 166). One of these key relationships was with Learning and Teaching Services (LTS), which was encouraged through the pairing of all Fellows with an Educational Designer to work with them on their project.

Strategies & Activities

Structure

The Scheme though originally developed and implemented by the Director of FLI with the assistance of a part-time research assistant; however, has developed to now employ a Strategic Projects Officer responsible for the day-to-day management of the scheme. This Officer supports the progression of the Fellows' projects, assists Fellows in clarifying necessary tasks, fosters connections between Educational Designers (EDs) and Fellows and others, and resolves issues as required. This change in structure has allowed a clearer separation of the Fellowships and the overarching research being conducted by the Director.

Practically, the Scheme funds Fellows a total of \$40,000 for twelve months (occasionally \$20,000 for six months) to buy out 50% of their teaching time to identify and focus on an idea relating to the possibilities of flexible delivery within their teaching area. Whilst funding a 100% buyout of teaching time for six months was discussed, this meant that schools and Faculties would face increased difficulties in replacing quality teaching academics, and the continued collegial engagement fostered by the 50% buyout was intended to promote collaboration between the Fellows, FLI, schools and faculties. This approach also intended to provide an opportunity for situated and transformative learning to occur (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Fellows could simultaneously call upon their Fellowship activities to enhance their teaching and at the same time, have their Fellowship informed by their teaching practice.

Recruitment

Fellows were recruited using an online process and to assist in selecting academics eligible for Fellowship appointments, the following criteria were developed (Flexible Learning Institute, 2009, p. 14):

- The Fellows should be, or have the capacity to become, highly motivated change agents in flexible learning and teaching within the school
- The Fellow should be working or interacting with at least 30% of academic staff within their school
- Their design based research proposal should involve the scholarship of teaching and learning and have the potential to introduce innovative pedagogical change to a course/subject within their own school

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

- The subjects or courses affected would ideally be identified as high priority areas by the Head of School and Director of FLI
- Applicants must have the approval of their Head of School, with schools supporting the Fellow's participation through time release and support of travel costs.

Communication

Participating Fellows have come from across six different campuses at CSU. This disparate model of operating and communicating (which is common to CSU) requires the Scheme to operate using a mixture of digital, online and face-to-face communications and media to operate effectively and equitably. Fellowships do however, commence with a face-to-face welcome and orientation workshop which aims to orientate the Fellows to the goals and activities of FLI, establish connections between the Fellows and FLI staff, share projects, goals and plans and build on original proposals.

Ongoing communication between the Fellows and FLI staff is based upon a range of media and digital networking tools including:

- Interact, the CSU Information Management and Digital Repository (built on the Sakai platform).
- Online Meeting tool (Wimba), which is used to conduct the 59mins@FLI webinar sessions.
- Pebblepad, a Personal Learning Space that is used by both the Strategic Projects Officer and the Fellows themselves for a range of activities and information.
- Twitter@FLINews, for sharing new 'finds' and ideas from key people in the blended learning world.
- Delicious, an online social bookmarking site where BFL resources are collated.
- Skype, for mentoring meetings between the Strategic Projects Officer and the Fellows.

Mentoring

A key strategy of the Fellowship program has been to provide mentoring for Fellows through a range of processes including:

- Face-to-face meetings. In 2011 the Strategic Projects Officer met face-to-face with the Fellows on an average of two occasions during the year related specifically to the development of their individual projects.
- Conversations and meetings via a range of social media and web communications mechanisms (such as those listed above), Bridgit (CSU's data conferencing software), email and phone are all conducted as needed by individual Fellows.

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

- The orientation workshop provides a chance to establish relationships between Fellows and the relevant FLI staff, share projects and discuss FLI and leadership in a face-to-face setting.
- Other mentoring also occurs less formally through the research interviews with the Director.

Research

The Fellowship scheme sought to foster research-based teaching and develop applied research outputs relevant to innovation in flexible learning and teaching. In response to this, Fellows have been required to conduct research as part of their Fellowship projects. The findings and outcomes of these projects have also been required to be disseminated through the publication of a book chapter or journal article, presentation/s at the CSUEd conference (internal learning and teaching conference) as well as other presentations both internal and external to CSU. Fellows are also invited to contribute to the research being conducted by the Director on the Scheme itself. This initially explored the notion of transformative learning relating to the introduction of blended and flexible learning across CSU. However, since its inception there has been a change of focus driven by the increasing recognition of Fellows as leaders in the CSU community, their schools and across the university. Thus, the research evolved to reflect this change and now focuses on distributive leadership.

Outcomes

Identifying explicit outcomes of the Scheme is difficult due to the complex interplay of factors involved in determining causality. The outcomes of individual Fellows could take the form of the artefacts they themselves developed, the learning and knowledge through this process, their interactions or influence with peers, the publications and presentations derived from Fellowship activities and/or their career progression post-Fellowship. After three and a half years of operation and four cohorts of Teaching Fellows across six CSU campuses, the Teaching Fellowship Scheme continues to be funded through the Office of the Deputy-Vice Chancellor Academic. During this period (2008-2011), the scheme has seconded a total of 24 academics as Teaching Fellows from 17 schools.

Drawing upon data collected as part of the Director's research into Transformative Learning, Keppell et al. (2010, p. 170-171) identified six predominant themes and impacts evident in the perceptions of the Teaching Fellows:

1. An enhanced understanding of pedagogy and of their own pedagogical approach
2. An increased capacity and willingness to reflect upon their own practice
3. A willingness to think critically about received ideas and conventional approaches
4. Being empowered to negotiate technological and institutional barriers to change

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

5. Preparedness to maximise the time/space opportunity of the Fellowship to actively engage in meaningful and relevant activities for their individual context
6. Equity and access.

A range of artefacts have been developed by the Fellows including virtual tutorials, interactive teaching resources, simulations as well as a range of different blended and flexible teaching approaches. In 2011, there was also an increased focus on promoting the activities of the Fellows and FLI in light of the implementation of changes to learning and teaching at CSU. To supplement these changes the Strategic Projects Officer, developed key resources including a DVD titled 'Exploring good practice in blended and flexible learning at CSU: The practitioner's voice', and individual Case Studies of Teaching Fellows from 2011. These digital resources are based on video footage of Fellows' presentations and interviews, as well as insights provided by the FLI Team providing real examples of BFL practice. Moreover, in accordance with their Fellowship requirements, Fellows have produced numerous publications and presentations on their Fellowship activities at the annual CSUed conference as well as at national and international conferences and events.

Many Teaching Fellows have gone on to gain recognition for their skills and leadership capabilities in receiving awards or being appointed to formal leadership roles. For example; two Fellows have been appointed Course Directors, one as Sub Dean: Learning and Teaching, two have received the CSU Vice-Chancellor's Awards for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, two others have been awarded ALTC Citations for Outstanding Contribution to Student Learning and one received the Vice-Chancellors Award for Excellence in Sustainability.

Challenges / Limitations

Drawing upon published materials and the tacit knowledge held by the researchers, a range of challenges and limitations faced by the individual Teaching Fellows as well as by the Scheme itself were identified.

Individual challenges faced by Teaching Fellows included time management skills, change overload, ensuring appropriate workloads, increasing casualisation excluding academics from participating, lack of institutional support for new technologies, rigidity around modes of study (no blended mode), and the presence of discipline-specific cultures.

The key challenges and limitations faced by the Teaching Fellowship Scheme included:

- Difficulties in backfilling the positions vacated by Fellows.

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

- Issues around how different schools understand the 50% buy-out of teaching, related time allowances and intended use for the funding.
- Lack of understanding surrounding Teaching Fellowship requirements and their funding arrangements as opposed to Research Fellowships.
- Limited staffing in the Flexible Learning Institute to support the scheme.
- Competition with other fellowships and research grants such as RIPPLE and the Collaborative Research Networks (CRN) program.
- A loss of quality teachers when academics are rewarded for good practice by being moved into non-teaching positions or into positions outside the university.
- Differences in school cultures, understandings and expectations regarding BFL and the importance of participating in schemes such as the Teaching Fellowship Scheme.
- Ongoing Interact Site development.
- Challenges with online/on campus blending (systems).
- Ongoing funding/sustainability of the Scheme due to an annual funding process.

Connections, Collegiality & Networks

The Scheme provides a chance for Fellows to consider the concepts of communities of practice and peer-learning as advocated by Boud (1999, p. 6) who suggested that reciprocal peer learning should include:

- Participants collaborating with each other within a learning community.
- Participants reflecting on their professional practice using peer-learning.
- Participants applying their knowledge within their own discipline in which like-minded peers provide constructive feedback and support.
- Participants taking collective responsibility for identifying their own learning needs.

Specific initiatives and activities that sought to foster connections, collegiality and networks in the TFS included:

- 59min@FLI; an interactive webinar which takes place every four weeks, involving past and present Fellows;
- Communications through the FLI media channels (Twitter, Interact, and blog).
- Presentations, meetings and discussions at the CSUEd annual conferences by Fellows and FLI

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

staff (formal and informal.

- Discussions between the Strategic Projects Officer and the Teaching Fellows.
- Presentations and publications nationally and internationally.
- Initial Welcome and Orientation Workshop for Fellows.
- Mentoring meetings with the Strategic Project Officer.
- Annual social function during CSUEd.
- Attention focused on the aspects of 'connection' in research interviews with the director.

Indicators of connections, collegiality and networks could include:

- Enduring relationships between fellows and with FLI staff developed during the Fellowship.
- Fellows being acknowledged as a 'go to person' within schools (informed other) and providing support for peers.
- Increased use and understanding of the role of Learning and Teaching Services (LTS) and EDs.
- The following behaviours may indicate the presence of a community of practice based on (Wenger, 1998) perceptions of learning as social participation in communities and organisations:
 1. The willingness of Fellows and FLI staff to participate in and contribute to activities such as the 59mins@FLI webinars.
 2. Attendance at voluntary social events within the TFS Community.
 3. Fellows expressed their thoughts about the importance and benefit of building such connections in the 2009 Flexible Learning Institute's Teaching Fellowship Scheme Project Report.

Reflective Practice & Practice Experimentation

Reflective practice and practice experimentation play a central role in the Teaching Fellowships. As noted by many of the Fellows, the Fellowships provide the time and space for them to step back from their day-to-day activities and engage in an iterative process of reflection and experimentation, overcoming what Taylor (1994) referred to as the 'tyranny of proximity'. For example, one Fellow (2008) noted that "... this has been the value of the FLI Fellowship for me - resources, time and headspace to actually be brave to try something new" (Flexible Learning Institute, 2009, p. 1).

The Director's own research, running in parallel to the Fellowships, is intended to encourage Fellows to engage in reflective practice, with the Director using the staged interviews (pre, mid

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

& post) to query their position and thoughts about blended and flexible learning and teaching. Feedback from the Fellows saw the introduction of an additional 6 month post completion reflective interview which enabled better understandings the outcomes and impact of the project. Questions asked during these interviews included; how the project outcome impacted on teaching practice and/or philosophy; and whether being involved in a Fellowship initiated new ideas or pathways, and changed ideas of BFL?

During 2008-2011 reflective practice was also supported by a number of other initiatives including:

- Mentoring activities and reflective conversations with FLI staff and other Fellows.
- A reflective journal was trialed in first round of Fellowships, however, it deemed impractical due to the time demands it placed on the Director in responding to these reflections and was thus discontinued.
- 59mins@FLI encourages Fellows to articulate their projects and their progress, and also asks for feedback from the audience.
- Publications and presentations such as those conducted at the DEHub Summit in February 2011, the annual CSUEd or for any other national or international event or journal.
- The production of individual case study videos and "The practitioner's voice" DVD afforded Fellows an opportunity to reflect upon their experiences as they were called to articulate their experiences and thoughts to the broad CSU community.

Reflections on Learning Leadership

The Teaching Fellowship Scheme is based on a Faculty-Scholar model of fostering change and innovation. Through providing time, resources and support, the FLI provides a platform for Fellows to successfully develop action-learning projects that influence their practice and the practice of colleagues. Leadership has not been a core component of this scheme, with no formal link between engagement in the scheme and career progression or even career status. The scheme has however, focused on building academic capacity and initiating change through innovative practice, development of good pedagogy, mentoring, promoting of self reflection and engaging in a community of like minded others.

The increasing recognition of Fellows as leaders evidenced in their appointment to formal leadership roles, however, promotes the idea that the Scheme builds the leadership capacity of Fellows. In fact, elements of the TFS parallel the Leadership Capacity Development Framework (LCDF) developed by Lefoe, et al. (2008) which focuses on growing, reflecting, enabling, engaging and networking. Some of the critical aspects of building leadership capacity in their

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

study (as noted by the scholars) were similar to those found in the TFS and these include (Lefoe et al., 2008, p.1-2):

- The provision of authentic learning activities situated in real contexts such as the faculty-based projects they engaged in.
- Access to strategic mentoring and coaching to assist in consolidating understanding.
- Engagement in reflective practice.

Lefoe et al. (2008) also noted the necessity of a willingness and desire on the part of the leader for successful leadership capacity development. This is important to consider in light of the self-nominating style of recruitment for Fellows which may indicate an inherent interest in development and/or leadership etc on behalf of the Fellow. It does simultaneously question the degree to which the Scheme develops or supports leadership or leaders? This is strongly shaped by the way one defines leadership; for as noted by (Stogdill, 1974, p. 258) “there are almost as many definitions of leadership as there are persons who have attempted to define the concept”. The traditional model of academic leadership may often be characterised by individual academic achievement and to some degree a responsibility for the academic development of others through such practices as research student supervision, however, this model has become increasingly criticised (Rowley, 1997). Thus, how one sees or defines leadership, and specifically, academic leadership, will affect the way they perceive the Teaching Fellowship Scheme and its ability to foster ‘leadership’.

Learning Leadership in this context is understood to be:

1. A strategy where the TFS provides the time and space to implement and reflect; an iterative process of learning for those involved.
2. A bottom up strategy supported by senior management and aligned with CSU strategic directions sees the strategy supported across many levels of the institution.
3. The fostering of a community of practice, through relationships with EDs, FLI staff, Fellows and others that encourages innovative research and practice in BFL.
4. Fellows demonstrating a willingness to collaborate, support and share practice.
5. The TFS providing opportunities for the development of skills and expertise that is recognised and accessed by peers.
6. The TFS supporting Fellows to have the confidence to take risks and experiment with something new.
7. Fellows demonstrating a willingness to engage in external activities and relationships, nationally and internationally.

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

In practice the Teaching Fellowship Scheme adheres to the design principles for transformative learning defined as a process by which previously uncritically assimilated assumptions, beliefs, values and perspectives are questioned and thereby become more open, permeable and better justified (Cranton, 2006, p. vi). The scheme is working to establish intersecting and collaborative communities of reflection and inquiry throughout the university, enabling the development of technological and pedagogical skills through a distributive leadership approach.

References

- Boud, D. (1999). Situating academic development in professional work: Using peer learning. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 4(1), 3. doi: 10.1080/1360144990040102
- Cranton, P. (2006). *Understanding and promoting transformative learning: A guide for educators of adults* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Dolence, M. G. & Norris, D. M. (1995). *Transforming higher education: A vision for learning in the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, MI, USA: Society for College and University Planning (SCUP).
- Flexible Learning Institute. (2009). *Teaching Fellowship Scheme: Project Report*. Charles Sturt University. Retrieved from: http://www.csu.edu.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0019/205570/TFReport2009.pdf
- Keppell, M., O'Dwyer, C., Lyon, B., & Childs, M. (2010). Transforming distance education curricula through distributive leadership. *ALT-J*, 18(3), 165 — 178. doi: 10.1080/09687769.2010.529112
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Learning in Doing: Social, Cognitive and Computational Perspectives)*. New York, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefoe, G., Parrish, D., Hart, G., Smigiel, H., & Pannan, L. (2008). *The GREEN report: Growing • Reflecting • Enabling • Engaging • Networking: The Development of Leadership Capacity in Higher Education*: Lead: University of Wollongong and University of Tasmania, Flinders University, & LaTrobe University. Retrieved from: <http://www.uow.edu.au/cedir/DistributiveLeadership/docs/GREEN_Report.pdf>
- Oblinger, D. G. & Oblinger, J. L. (2005). *Educating the Net Generation*. EDUCAUSE. ISBN: 0-9672853-2-1. Retrieved from: <www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/pub7101.pdf>
- This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).

- Reeves, T. C. (2000). *Enhancing the Worth of Instructional Technology Research through "Design Experiments" and Other Development Research Strategies*. Paper presented at the International Perspectives on Instructional Technology Research for the 21st Century. Retrieved from: <www.itech1.coe.uga.edu/~treeves/AERA2000Reeves.pdf>
- Roche, V. (2001). Professional development models and transformative change: A case study of indicators of effective practice in higher education. *The International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2), 121-129.
- Rowley, J. (1997). "Academic leaders: made or born?". *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29(3), 78-84.
- Scott, G. (2004). Change matters: Making a difference in higher education. In R. Carmichael (Ed.), *Australian Universities Quality Forum: Quality in a Time of Change*. Adelaide: Australian Universities Quality Agency. Retrieved from: <www.auqa.edu.au>
- Scott, G., Coates, H. & Anderson, M. (2008). *Learning leaders in times of change: Academic leadership capabilities for Australian higher education*. The University of Melbourne. Retrieved from: <www.repository.unimelb.edu.au/10187/8757>
- Stogdill, R. M. (1974). *Handbook of leadership: a survey of theory and research*. Free Press. Retrieved from: <www.books.google.com.au/books/about/Handbook_of_leadership.html?id=RG6xAAAAIAAJ&redir_esc=y>
- Taylor, J. C. (1994). Technology, distance education and the tyranny of proximity. *Higher Education Management*, 6(2), 179-190.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity* (2002 ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

This case study is an extract from the report, *Managing institutional change through distributive leadership approaches: Engaging academics and teaching support staff in blended and flexible learning*, by Childs, M., Brown, M., Keppell, M., Nicholas, Z., Hunter, C. & Hard, N. (2012).