

International collaboration to align institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogy in higher education

Harry Hubball^a and Anna-May Edwards-Henry^b

^aCentre for Teaching, Learning and Technology, University of British Columbia (UBC), Vancouver, British Columbia; ^bInstructional Development Unit (IDU), The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago

This paper examines an international collaboration between the Universities of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago, and the University of British Columbia, Canada, to align institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice. Data suggest that despite traditional institutional challenges with respect to curricula and pedagogical development, international collaborations and the strategic range of institutional SoTL leadership initiatives has positively impacted learning-centred curricula, course syllabi and teaching practices, as well as local, national and international SoTL initiatives.

Keywords: institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice

Context

The University of the West Indies (UWI) is an independent University serving 16 English-speaking territories of the Caribbean region, with four campuses, namely, St. Augustine, Trinidad; Mona, Jamaica; Cave Hill, Barbados and the Open Campus (a virtual campus). The total enrolment in The UWI in 2010 was 40,908, of which St. Augustine had 37%, Mona 35%, Cave Hill 18% and the Open Campus 10%. The focus of this paper is the St. Augustine campus in Trinidad and Tobago.

On the St. Augustine Campus, at the time of this writing, there are five faculties (Engineering, Humanities and Education, Medical Sciences, Science and Agriculture and Social Sciences) with approximately 9,850 undergraduate students, 2,509 graduate students, and 350 academic staff. The UWI's Strategic Plan 2007-2012 describes teaching and learning as the University's primary pillar and thus makes reference to providing high quality educational programmes, key graduate outcomes and learning-centred teaching strategies. The UWI St. Augustine's institutional teaching and learning initiative is being led by its Instructional Development Unit (IDU). In light of this unique academic context and the outcomes-based curricula implications stemming from the Strategic Plan, an international collaboration with external scholars and a strategic initiative with the University of British Columbia (UBC) provided the impetus for a comprehensive needs assessment across all faculties to identify current programming strengths and weaknesses, as well as strategic staff development initiatives to enhance learning-centred curricula and pedagogical practices. It is this background context that provides insight for the following investigation.

Transition toward learning-centred curricula in institutional contexts

Global, national, and regional factors, for example, growing social diversity and economic challenges, accreditation requirements and significant shifts toward learning-centred educational practices, are fuelling profound change with respect to academic development, curricula and pedagogy on university campuses (Bergen Communique, 2005; Bresciani, 2007; Gray & Radloff, 2006, 2008; OCAV, 2005). In an attempt to address these critical challenges, research-intensive universities in North America, Australia, the West Indies, Asia, the United Kingdom and Europe are developing learning-centred curricula that focus on explicit student learning outcomes, integrated and strategically sequenced learning experiences throughout key programme phases (including educational technologies), effective teaching methods, authentic assessment practices, and scholarly approaches to curriculum and pedagogy (Chickering & Gamson, 1987; Fish & Coles, 2005; Hubball, Clarke & Poole, 2010; McKinney & Cross, 2007; Poindexter, 2003; Shavelson, 2007).

However, research suggests that implementing learning-centred curricula is a complex, multifaceted, reflective and iterative process (Hubball & Burt, 2004; Hubball & Gold, 2007; Schnieder & Schoenberg, 1999). It is shaped by many factors (social, political, economic, organizational, cultural and individual) and involves people at various institutional levels (administrators, curriculum development committee personnel, instructors and learners) in complex settings (Stes, Clement & Van Petegem, 2007). Not surprisingly, therefore, the localised development and implementation of learning-centred curricula poses significant pedagogical, as well as administrative challenges for most institutions and academic units.

Facilitating effective curricula learning communities: Research and practice implications

Various frameworks and models have been proposed in the literature to enhance the development, implementation, and evaluation of learning-centred undergraduate curricula (Diamond, 1998; Fish & Coles, 2005; Hubball & Gold, Mighty & Britnell, 2007; Wolfe & Hill, 2006). Research suggests that curriculum learning communities (CLC's) are at the heart of learning-centred curricula and pedagogical practices in multidisciplinary settings (Baldwin, 2008; Friedman, 2008; Cox & Richlin, 2004; Harp Ziegenfuss & Lawler, 2008; Hubball & Albon, 2007; Hubball & Pearson, 2010; Knight & Trowler, 2000; Warhurst, 2006). While the literature on CLC's typically focus on active work groups within institutional or academic unit contexts (Cox, 2004; Hubball & Clarke, 2010), there is a growing recognition that the broader reach of CLC's extend to the benefits of global and inter-institutional collaborations in higher education. These espoused values are often manifested through efforts to attract international students and to provide students with study-abroad exchange opportunities. However, faculty members are likely to benefit as much as students from the exposure (and adaptations) to different cultural environments, cross-cultural SoTL understandings and responses to common environmental, health, human rights, and other concerns, as well as the opportunity to examine, collaborate and disseminate effective curricula and pedagogical practices that rich international collaborations afford (Wang, Peng, Pearson & and Hubball, In press; Van Hoof & Verbeeten, 2005).

Global and local CLC's are key for engaging institutions, staff developers and academic units in scholarly approaches to curriculum and pedagogical practices in order to address critical issues. These issues include situational-specific assessments of curriculum needs and best practices; literature sources and theoretical frameworks that are appropriate to inform effective discipline-specific curriculum and pedagogical practices;

indicators of success for responsive, cutting-edge, exciting and dynamic undergraduate curricula; and, potential research questions that are important to enhance learning-centred curricula change.

CLC's are also key for developing programme-level learning outcomes which are a central component of learning-centred curricula (Benjamin, 2008; Hubball & Burt, 2007). Essentially, learning outcomes can occur at many different levels (e.g. professional accreditation, quality assessment reviews, institutional planning, programme development, individual course design and integrated course alignments) in the form of "top-down" and/or "bottom-up" processing, each of which (and various combinations) can have significant implications for implementing learning-centred educational practices (Hubball & Gold, 2007). Responsive learning outcomes are brought to life in strategically sequenced curriculum learning experiences such as first, second, third and fourth-year fully on-line course modules. They are also brought to life in individual courses through a diverse range of pedagogies such as collaborative projects, student presentations, interactive lecture techniques and authentic assessment practices (Albon & Hubball, 2004; Driscoll & Wood, 2007; Grunert O'Brien, Millis, & Cohen, 2008; Hubball & Levy, 2004; Ruohoniemi & Lindblom-Ylänne, 2009; Senge & Scharmer, 2008; Shavelson, 2007).

In the context of CLC's, research suggests that integrated and stage-specific curriculum and pedagogical support frameworks enhance the development and implementation of learning-centred curricula in multidisciplinary settings (Hubball & Burt, 2006; Hubball, Mighty, Britnell, & Gold, 2007). For example, in the early stages of considering and developing a learning-centred curriculum, institutions and units can benefit from external or international speakers who are presenting research, relevant literature, methodologies and workshops on the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice in diverse disciplinary settings (Hubball & Clarke, 2010).

At mid-stages of learning-centred curriculum change, institutions and units can benefit from expert consultancy support for sub-disciplinary stream leaders. Institutions can also benefit from faculty meetings with respect to developing curriculum learning communities, developing programme level learning outcomes, effective teaching and learning strategies, authentic assessment, and curriculum integration (vertically and horizontally) of collective and individual course offerings. In the advanced stages of learning-centred curriculum change, institutions and units can benefit from workshop and consultancy support on curriculum evaluation and action research methodologies and considerations for conducting the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice in higher education (Hubball, Mighty, Britnell, & Gold, 2007; Hubball & Pearson, 2010; Kreber & Brook, 2001; McKinney & Cross, 2007).

Very little research has investigated international collaborations to align institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice in higher education. This paper represents a preliminary study based on initial findings and reflections. Specifically, the following research questions were designed to facilitate teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogy at the UWI St. Augustine:

1. What is the impact of the international collaborations for advancing the teaching and learning agenda at (primarily) the UWI St. Augustine?
2. Given the institutional context for teaching and learning at the UWI St. Augustine, how did the international collaboration contribute to the enhancement of (a) curricular practices? (b) effective staff development initiatives to enhance learning-centred curricula?

Method

To address the above research questions, a variety of qualitative methods were used to collect data over the period 2005 to 2008. These methods included focus group interviews, workshop evaluation surveys, and analysis of individual teaching portfolios and institutional document reviews pertaining to teaching and learning policies (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001; Hubball & Clarke, 2010a; Mills, 2000). Four relevant stakeholder groups were consulted to provide critical data to assess campus-wide curriculum practices and support services including: six external visiting scholars and educational developers; two curriculum leader representatives selected by the Dean from each of the five faculties; three groups of fifteen to twenty workshop participants attending the IDU's faculty seminar series on course design; and a cohort of 15 UWI SoTL Leaders participating in the eight month mixed-mode faculty certificate programme at the University of British Columbia (UBC). With regard to questions 1 and 2(a):

1. External visiting scholars and faculty developers were invited to engage in a critical review of UWI's institutional mission statement and Strategic Plan 2007-2012 and to report findings and recommendations to the IDU Director.
2. Chaired by the IDU Director, critical data were obtained from campus-wide faculty curriculum representatives (n=10) who met three times per year to engage in a critical discussion about degree programme practices (strengths and weaknesses).
3. Data were gathered from multidisciplinary faculty participants (n=15-20 per workshop) during, and on completion of three specific campus-wide IDU workshops that focused on developing learning-centred curricula, assessment of programme-level learning outcomes, and learning-centred teaching methods.
4. Chaired by the UBC educational developer, focus group interviews were conducted with fifteen UWI SoTL Leaders at the mid-stage of their eight month enrollment in the mixed-mode faculty certificate programme (2007-2008) at the UBC.

In order to address question 2(b), the external visiting scholars and faculty developers were invited to engage in a critical review of UWI's current and proposed staff development initiatives in order to meet the demand and challenges of campus-wide learning-centred teaching methods. This included:

1. A review of the visiting scholars presentation series, IDU seminars/workshops over one semester, the UWI/Guardian Life Premium Teaching Award, Teaching and Learning Research Day, and the proposed two-year Master in Higher Education (MHEd) Tertiary Level Teaching and Learning programme which began in 2009.
2. Chaired by the IDU Director, critical data were obtained from ten campus-wide faculty curriculum representatives who met three times per year to engage in a critical discussion about the challenges their colleagues faced with respect to learning-centred curriculum practices and the sorts of suggestions each had for responsive staff development initiatives.
3. Workshop evaluation data were gathered from multidisciplinary faculty participants (n=15-20 per workshop) on completion of ten campus-wide IDU workshops that were held throughout the 2006 semester. Workshop feedback focused on participant satisfaction and their perceived abilities to develop learning-centred teaching methods and assess student learning outcomes, as well as further suggestions for staff development initiatives.

4. A critical examination was taken of individual teaching portfolios, as well as focus group interviews with the fifteen UWI SoTL Leaders and five UWI Teaching Award winners (2007-2008). In particular, portfolios were reviewed with respect to an analysis of learning-centred course syllabi, classroom research projects, peer-review of teaching practices, and pedagogical leadership presentations. Follow-up focus group interviews then focused on this cohort's on-going investigations into diverse educational practices, and the sorts of suggestions each had for responsive staff development initiatives on the campus.
5. Finally, there was, and continues to be, a process of critical reflection on staff development proposals and activities undertaken by the UWI St. Augustine through discourse and commentary between the educational developers from the UWI and UBC (Friedman, 2008; Senge & Scharmer, 2008).

Conversations began in 2005-2006 and have continued with face-to-face discussions and cross-campus exchanges with respect to global perspectives on curriculum and pedagogical practices in higher education. A series of four campus-wide workshop exchanges have taken place on the UWI St. Augustine campus since December 2006, and two cohorts of UWI St. Augustine faculty members have since participated in the SoTL Leadership Program at the UBC. The range of qualitative data thus obtained was analyzed for common and isolated experiences and for major themes (Baldwin, 2008; Hubball & Clarke, 2010b; Merriam, 2002; McKinney & Cross, 2007; Patton, 1990; Silverman, 2000).

Results

Q1 Results: Impact of the international collaboration for advancing the teaching and learning agenda at (primarily) The University of the West Indies (UWI), St. Augustine

The concept of SoTL was not exactly new to the work of the IDU. From the inception of its UWI/Guardian Life Premium Open Lecture series in 2001, there had been a focus on teaching scholarship throughout its faculty development initiatives. The lecture series, as well as workshops, were delivered by renowned proponents of SoTL such as Charles E. Glassick (2001), K. Patricia Cross (2003), Keith Trigwell (2005), Daniel Pratt (2007), Eileen Herteis (2005, 2008), and Harry Hubball (2006-2008). Data suggest that these lectures served as a catalyst to heighten interest in SoTL and learning-centred curricula across campus. However, it is clearly unrealistic to expect the systematic adoption of scholarly approaches to curricula and pedagogical change from a guest speaker series and in the absence of strategic institutional and faculty-wide supports and incentives.

The added significance of the strategic international collaboration between educational developers at the UWI St. Augustine and UBC played a critical role in systematically advancing the teaching and learning agenda on the UWI campus, as well as the long-term benefits and partnerships for both the UWI St. Augustine and the UBC in terms of: unique SoTL research opportunities, cultural exchange and opportunities to learn from adaptations and expertise within each other's teaching and learning context, support for institutional programming, and enhanced global perspectives of SoTL.

Specifically, two consecutive distance cohorts of UWI St. Augustine faculty members participated in an eight month SoTL leadership programme at the UBC. This programme engages faculty members to investigate scholarly approaches to curriculum practice in various undergraduate and graduate programme settings. Graduates of this SoTL leadership programme include over two hundred and fifty faculty members from

a wide range of institutions (Canadian and International universities). In this context, the UWI St. Augustine graduates have been exposed to key SoTL literature sources and concepts, developed particular methodological expertise in SoTL research, formed the basis for an on-campus SoTL group at UWI, as well as became institutional leaders to contribute to the implementation of The UWI Certificate in University Teaching and the Master in Higher Education (MHEd) Tertiary Level Teaching and Learning.

Spearheaded by the Director of the IDU (and paralleled in the UBC context), a curriculum and pedagogical support service has also been employed on the St. Augustine campus to enhance the development and implementation of learning-centred curricula across all five Faculties. For example, various representatives and faculty members attended IDU workshop facilitated by faculty and external speakers on various SoTL related issues including:

- curriculum learning communities;
- developing programme level learning outcomes;
- effective teaching and learning strategies;
- authentic assessment; curriculum integration (vertically and horizontally); curriculum evaluation and action research methodologies.

Thus, localized programmes were strategically established to enhance institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice on the UWI St. Augustine campus.

For UBC personnel, this collaborative invitation formed the basis for a unique and rich research opportunity consistent with UBC's international reputation, institutional curricular renewal initiatives, as well as shared mutual benefits with respect to on-going partnerships and international scholarship that were integral to the institutional missions at both universities. In addition to the wealth of cultural exchanges and institutional adaptations, the complexities of this two-way international collaboration mostly focused on the challenging logistics of distance and different time zones which had implications for flight travel, as well as the ability to conduct timely video conference meetings. However, both research-intensive institutions are relatively well resourced and key participants were flexible and enthusiastic to accommodate these minor barriers in order to conduct this scholarship in both attractive areas of the world: Vancouver and the Caribbean. Further, the educational developers from both institutions fully engaged in mutual respect to honour, learn about, and fit into respective institutional customs, norms, successes, histories, and challenges that enhance and sustain collegial working relationships in a global context. Thus, the significant success of the collaboration (as already documented) in achieving its objectives is further evident by the evaluation and fifth year continuation plans by the respective organizations at UBC and UWI, St. Augustine to commence the next faculty cohort in September 2011. For example, on-going site visits, review of participant portfolio assignments, critical reflections by educational developers, and interviews with UWI St. Augustine programme participants and the Principal's Office were used to gauge whether or not the international collaboration was effective in meeting the needs and circumstances of the campus, particularly with respect to enhancing scholarly approaches to curriculum and pedagogical practices within complex disciplinary contexts.

Q2(a) Results: Given the institutional context for teaching and learning at the UWI St. Augustine, how did the international collaboration contribute to the enhancement of curricular practices?

Data from focus group interviews with UWI curriculum and SoTL Leaders, as well as campus-wide workshop participant feedback suggest that in many academic settings, undergraduate programme structures and innovative curriculum strategies were largely invisible on faculty notice boards and on busy departmental meeting agendas. It was also not clear to many students or faculty members within these programmes how, if at all, individual courses and modules were integrated and progressively sequenced throughout multi-year programme learning experiences. Even less clear to students was how individual courses contributed to overall programme-level learning outcomes, if indeed this was explicitly stated. Furthermore, traditional curricular development practices on campus tended to be characterized by the following:

- attention was afforded to adding, modifying, and “tinkering” with individual course offerings within the overall structure of undergraduate programmes;
- curriculum was typically viewed as a means for students to accumulate course “credits” rather than tangible evidence of strategic learning experiences, progressive learning outcomes and student achievement;
- pedagogy was narrowly and almost exclusively viewed as a traditional lecture-format whereby student assessment was often limited to methods such as mid-term and final examinations;
- overall programme structures tended to consist of too many ‘old and tired’ (rather than current, responsive and flexible course offerings that were adaptable to changes in the overall field of study) individual registered course offerings; and
- finally, minimal attention was afforded to on-going and systematic curriculum evaluations consistent with scholarly approaches to curriculum and pedagogical practices.

Data from a representative sample of UWI St. Augustine curriculum personnel, SoTL leaders and campus-wide workshop participants commenting about traditional approaches to curricular practices within units were as follows:

By far the most dominant method for teaching in our faculty is a reliance on the traditional lecture method and brief opportunities for students to pose questions at the end... Since at least 60% of the student assessment has to be based on the final exam, other than a possible mid-term quiz, this tends to be the usual way that student learning is assessed... assessment methods other than the final exam are viewed as too subjective, biased and time consuming...rarely does our unit discuss systematic programme development or evaluation – if anything, it is usually focused on individual course changes or proposals... Curriculum changes in our programme are based completely on pragmatic and situational decision-making without any connection to the higher education literature or best practices...Students tend to just go from one course to the next, and try and get through each one by passing the final exam – ultimately, this is seen to be progressing successfully through the programme!...curriculum evaluation in our faculty, usually involves a mad panic every 5 or so years to assemble and tidy course materials etc but life resumes as normal shortly after!...Faculty mostly have little idea what students are doing in other courses in the programme and largely just concentrate on their own course.

In contrast, data suggest that those units on campus with dynamic curriculum learning communities had developed a stronger sense of ownership, and shared responsibility and

accountability for curriculum and pedagogical practices in undergraduate and graduate programmes. These particular curricular learning communities were characterized by a critical mass of administrators, faculty members, colleagues in the field, and students who were engaged in discourse around consensus building and curriculum visioning. Data from a representative sample of curriculum personnel, SoTL Leaders and campus-wide workshop participants commenting about innovative approaches to curricular practices within units were as follows:

Some of us [faculty] in our unit are experimenting with alternative ways to assess 40% of the students mark by using self-assessment and group projects or presentations... I'm trying to build in more in-class self-assessment opportunities for students in my course...yes, curriculum is now on our [department's] agenda with visual and verbal reports from various working groups at meetings... our students are increasingly active in voicing positive and negative things about the programme which is changing things, albeit slowly...we've some faculty doing some really interesting things by combining their coursework with students' field experiences or learning technologies...we've got a committee working on developing graduate portfolios with links to various coursework activities within our programme...although far from set and without controversy, we've developed a general consensus about our programme learning outcomes which also align with UWI's graduate outcomes document... We are currently changing our course syllabi in our programme to be more learning-centred...In my leadership role, I've been asked to gather and share information on 'active learning strategies – the workshops, support and resources from IDU have been very useful...a number of us on campus have been asked to present our work on learning-centred course design and teaching methods at Departmental meetings.

Data suggest that effective curriculum learning communities tended to develop and adopt programme-level learning outcomes that were typically expressed through discipline-specific graduate attributes such as [in the context of 'X' discipline, students will develop the following]:

- the acquisition, application and integration of knowledge;
- research skills, including the ability to define problems and access, retrieve and evaluate information;
- critical thinking and problem-solving; proficient literacy and numeracy skills;
- responsible use of ethical principles;
- effective leadership, communication and interpersonal skills.

Furthermore, effective curriculum learning communities on campus were also more likely to implement and experiment with a wide array of effective teaching and learning methods including student presentations, self-directed on-line learning modules, problem-based learning methods, student portfolios, field work assignments, journaling, interactive lecture techniques, and, strategic self, peer and instructor assessment practices. Essentially, data suggested that innovative curriculum learning communities tended to draw upon theory-driven and evidence-based curriculum and pedagogical practices.

Q2(b) Results: Given the institutional context for teaching and learning at the UWI St. Augustine, how did the international collaboration contribute to effective staff development initiatives to enhance learning-centred curricula on the campus?

Data suggest that the following inter-institutional and faculty support strategies were particularly effective for enhancing the development and implementation of learning-centred curricula on campus:

- inter-institutional staff development programmes for curriculum leaders that focused on the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practices in higher education;
- attention to curricula and pedagogical contributions through recommended tenure and promotion processes;
- initiation of curriculum grants, curriculum leadership and innovative course design awards;
- providing on-site curricula and pedagogical expertise to support and assist units and faculty members with critical transitions toward learning-centred curricula (e.g., workshops on facilitating curriculum learning communities, curriculum design and integration, learning-centred assessment practices and course design, diverse active learning strategies in the university classroom, and scholarly approaches to curriculum and pedagogy); and
- institutional conferences that celebrate research on, for and about curriculum and pedagogical practices.

Data from a representative sample of UWI St. Augustine curriculum personnel, SoTL leaders and campus-wide workshop participants commenting about effective staff development initiatives on and off the campus were as follows:

The UBC SoTL Leadership programme exposed us to a vast and useful SoTL literature, as well as methodological approaches to investigate our practices, and a wide range of effective teaching and learning strategies...I really appreciated doing the SoTL project whereby I was able to develop a SoTL investigation around the use of on-line student submission practices and hopefully get published...I feel so much more prepared and informed about SoTL although - still lots to learn till I'm totally confident in this field...I now feel like I've got the tools to be a confident teacher-researcher and make a better contribution to the programme in our Department...It's connecting with others on campus that I really learn most from, even though that's not my initial motivation to attend these [IDU] workshops...the IDU does a great job of keeping us knowledgeable about developments in teaching through these workshops and the teaching-research conference events on campus...really useful workshops and meeting other colleagues on campus to discuss similar issues, challenges and strategies...to see examples from excellent teachers [award winners] around campus, and be able to discuss applications in my field is really useful at these workshops and teaching events.

Data in this study suggest that much work is still to be done with respect to effective staff development. Specific areas needing attention are for example:

- curriculum and pedagogical contributions through all levels of tenure and promotion processes;

- more training provision to develop local expertise with respect to learning-centred curriculum development; and
- greater access to grant funding and curriculum leadership/innovative course design awards).

In spite of the need for improvements, the strategic inter-institutional collaboration and range of SoTL leadership initiatives developed on the UWI St. Augustine campus have positively impacted the following outcomes:

- implementation of learning-centred curricula, course syllabi and teaching practices;
- collegial sharing of information and new voices of expertise, as well as continuing discourse around issues of curriculum and pedagogical practice;
- teaching development and diverse student learning experiences;
- institutional, national and international SoTL collaborations.

Data from faculty perspectives generally suggest there is increasingly (albeit slow and disparate in many units) incremental change toward learning-centred curricula and pedagogical practices on the UWI St. Augustine campus. However, there are no data from students (or about them) to suggest the extent to which programme-level learning outcomes were being implemented. Thus, further studies are required to investigate the full scope and impact of curriculum change over time on the St. Augustine campus, as well the growth of collaborative research and publications pertaining to the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practices.

Conclusions

This is a preliminary study based on initial findings and reflections from on-going collaborations commensurate with campus-wide curriculum and pedagogical development initiatives at UWI (primarily) and UBC. Specifically, this article examines an international collaboration to align institutional teaching development, learning-centred curricula, and the scholarship of curriculum and pedagogical practice in higher education. Clearly, key two-way scholarship and cultural exchange benefits emerged from this international collaboration between educational developers in two research-intensive institutions. Research in this study suggests that academic units are at critically different stages of curriculum change, and that there are no quick-fix solutions to successfully developing and implementing learning-centred curricula. Learning-centred curriculum change is a labour intensive, time consuming, community-driven process that requires adequate scholarly attention, leadership, expertise, and institutional and faculty-wide support. By drawing on strategic international and inter-institutional collaborations as part of the broader potential for CLC's, and linking learning-centred curricula with properly aligned teaching development plans within institutions is, therefore, critical for successful implementation. Guiding principles and comprehensive strategies are provided from critical lessons learned in diverse undergraduate and graduate degree programme contexts at the UWI St. Augustine and the UBC.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to express their sincere thanks to all faculty members at the UWI St. Augustine who provided critical contributions regarding campus-wide curricula and pedagogical practices.

References

- Albon, S., & Hubball, H.T. (2004). Course design in pharmaceutical sciences: A learning-centred approach. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 68(5), pp 1-10. Retrieved from <http://www.ajpe.org/aj6805/aj6805114/aj6805114.pdf>
- Baldwin, M. (2008). Working together, learning together: Co-operative inquiry in the development of complex practice by teams of social workers. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research* (pp. 221-228). London: Sage Publications.
- Benjamin, R. (2008). The case for comparative institutional assessment of higher order thinking skills, *Change*, 40(6), 51-55.
- Bergen Communique (2005). The European higher education area: Achieving the goals. *Communique of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education: The Bologna Process*, Bergen, May.
- Brandt, B.F., Clements, M., & Piascik, P (1998). Problem-solving activities for first-year pharmacy students. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 62, 450-457.
- Bresciani, M.J. (2006). *Outcomes-based academic and co-curricular programme review*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Bullough, R., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 13-21.
- Chickering, A. W., & Gamson, Z. F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *The Wingspread Journal*, 9(2), Special Section.
- Cox, M., & Richlin, L. (2004). Building faculty learning communities. In Cox, M., & Richlin, L (Eds), *New directions for teaching and learning 97*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Cross, K.P. (2003). Learning is about making connections. *Campus-wide lecture presentation, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, September 2003.
- Diamond, R.M. (1998). *Developing and assessing courses and curricula*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Driscoll, A., & Wood, S. (2007). *Outcomes-based assessment for learning-centred education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Fish, D., & Coles, C. (2005). *Medical education: Developing a curriculum for practice*. Milton Keynes, UK: Open University Press.
- Friedman, V.J. (2008). Action science: Creating communities of inquiry in communities of practice. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds), *Handbook of action research* (131-143), London: Sage Publications.
- Fullan, M.G. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change* (3rd Ed.). New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Glassick, C. E. (2001). Multiple scholarships and their assessment. *Campus-wide lecture presentation, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, December 2001.
- Gray, K., & Radloff, A. (2008). The idea of impact and its implications for academic development work. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 13(2), 97-106.
- Gray, K., & Radloff, A. (2006). Quality management of academic development work: Implementation issues and challenges, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 11(2), 79 – 90.
- Grunert O'Brien, J., Millis, B.J., & Cohen, M.J. (2008). *The course syllabus: A learning-centered approach* (2nd Ed.). Anker Publishers.
- Harp Ziegenfuss, D., & Lawler, P.A. (2008). Collaborative course design: changing the process, acknowledging the context, and implications for academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 13(3), 151 – 160.
- Herteis, E. (2005, 2008). Assessment of programme-level learning outcomes. *Campus-wide lecture presentation, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, December 2008.
- Hubball, H., & Clarke, A. (2010). Diverse methodological approaches and considerations for SoTL in higher education. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1). Retrieved from <http://www.nscaa.com/soccerjournal.php>
- Hubball, H., Clarke, A., & Poole, G. (2010). Ten-year reflections on mentoring SoTL research in a research-intensive university. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 15(2), 117-129.
- Hubball, H.T., & Pearson, M. (2010). Grappling with the complexity of undergraduate degree programme reform: Critical barriers and emergent strategies. *Transformative Dialogues*, 3(3). Retrieved from http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cjsotl_rcacea/vol1/iss1/2.
- Hubball, H.T. (2006-08). The scholarship of teaching and learning; learning-centred curricula change; action

- research methodology; assessment for development. *Campus-wide lecture presentations, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, December, February and March.
- Hubball, H.T., & Albon, S. (2007). Developing a faculty learning community: enhancing the scholarship of teaching, learning and curriculum practice. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 18(2), 119-142.
- Hubball, H.T., & Clarke, A. (2009). Diverse methodological approaches and considerations for conducting the scholarship of teaching and learning in higher education. *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1(1), Article 2.
- Hubball, H.T., & Gold, N. (2007). *The scholarship of curriculum practice and undergraduate programme reform: Theory-practice integration*. In P. Wolfe and J. Christensen Hughes (Eds.). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning (the "Journal")*, 112, (5-14). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.**
- Hubball, H.T., Pratt, D.D., & Collins, J. (2005). Investigating changes in teaching perspectives for faculty enrolled in the UBC Faculty Certificate Program on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. *Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, 35(3), 57-81.
- Hubball, H.T., Mighty, J., Britnell, J. & Gold, N. (2007). Learning-centred undergraduate curricula in programme, institutional and provincial contexts. In P. Wolfe and J. Christensen Hughes (Eds.) *New Directions for Teaching and Learning (the "Journal")* 112, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hubball, H.T., & Burt, H. (2007). Learning outcomes and programme-level evaluation in a 4-Year undergraduate pharmacy curriculum. *American Journal for Pharmaceutical Education*, 71(5), Article 90, 1-8.
- Hubball, H.T., & Burt, H.D. (2006). Scholarship of teaching and learning: Theory practice integration in faculty certificate programmes. *Innovative Higher Education*, 30(5), 327-344.
- Hubball, H.T., & Poole, G. (2003). A learning-centred faculty certificate programme on university teaching. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 8(2), 11-24.
- Hubball, H.T., & Burt, H.D. (2004). An integrated approach to developing and implementing learning-centred curricula. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 9(1), 51-65.
- Hubball, H.T., & Levy, A. (2004). Graduate course design in health care and epidemiology: A learning-centred approach. *Journal for Faculty Development*, 20 (1), 11-19.
- Knight, P.T., & Trowler, P.R. (2000). Department level cultures and the improvement of learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 69-83.
- Kreber, C., & Brook, P. (2001). Impact evaluation of educational development programmes. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(2), 96-108.
- Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- McKinney, K., & Cross, P. (2007). *Enhancing learning through the scholarship of teaching and learning: The challenges and joys of juggling*. JB Anker Series/Wiley and Sons.
- Mills, G. E. (2001). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- OCAV (2005). *Working group report on university undergraduate degree level expectations*. Ontario Council of Academic Vice-Presidents, October. http://72.14.253.104/search?q=cache:gsQ9IKN9NDMJ:www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/general/OCAV_Guidelines_2005.pdf+Ontario+Council+of+Academic+Vice-Presidents&hl=en&gl=ca&ct=clnk&cd=3
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods*. California: Sage Publications
- Poddexter, S. (2003). Holistic learning. *Change*, January/February 25-30.
- Pratt, D. (2007). Can excellence take different forms in scholarly teaching? Exploring our teaching biases. *Campus-wide lecture presentation, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, September.
- Raman-Wilms, L. (2001). Innovative enabling strategies in self-directed, problem-based therapeutics: Enhancing student preparedness for pharmaceutical care practice. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 65, 56-64.
- Ruohoniemi, M., & Lindblom-Ylänne, S. (2009). Students' experiences concerning course workload and factors enhancing and impeding their learning - a useful resource for quality enhancement in teaching and curriculum planning. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 14(1), 69-81.
- Schneider, C.G., & Shoenberg, R. (1999). Habits hard to break: How persistent features of campus life frustrate curricular reform. *Change*, March/April, 30-35.
- Senge, P.M., & Scharmer, C.O. (2008). Community action research: Learning as a community of practitioners, consultants and researchers. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury. *Handbook of action research* (Eds.), (195-206). London: Sage Publications.
- Shavelson, R. (2007). Assessing student learning responsibility: From history to an audacious proposal. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 39(1), 26-33.
- Silverman, D. (2000). *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stes, A., Clement, M., & Van Petegem, P. (2007). The effectiveness of a faculty training programme: Long-term and institutional impact, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 12(2), 99-109.

- Trigwell, K. (2005), Quality teaching for the twenty-first century. *Campus-wide lecture presentation, The University of the West Indies, St. Augustine, Trinidad and Tobago*, December.
- Van Hoof, H. B., & Verbeeten, M. (2005). Wine is for drinking, water is for washing: Student opinions about international exchange programmes. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 9(1), 42-61.
- Wang, B., Peng, J., Pearson, M. & and Hubball, H.T. (In press). Internationalization of a faculty SoTL programme: Immersion experiences of Beijing professors in a Canadian research-intensive university. *International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 5(2).
- Warhurst, R. P. (2006). “We Really Felt Part of Something”: Participatory learning among peers within a university teaching-development community of practice, *International Journal for Academic Development*, 11(2), 111 – 122.
- Wolf, P., Hill, A., & Evers, F. (2006) *A handbook for curriculum assessment*. Ontario:University of Guelph Publications.