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Abstract

This paper reports on an on-going experiment in the School of Management at the University of Surrey whereby the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is being developed and promoted through a series of different interventions which, taken together, can be classified as organic in nature. The paper suggests that, given the nature of such scholarship, this is likely to be an appropriate approach to its development. The paper is organised in a fairly straightforward way. It begins with a brief discussion of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning which establishes a loose set of principles which may govern its development. The paper then discusses the theory of organic approaches to management and, on the basis of this theory, provides a conceptual framework through which it can be developed. The next section of the paper provides details of the School of Management’s approach and uses the conceptual framework as a mechanism to explain what has happened and why. Finally, the paper offers a discussion of some of the main lessons from this experiment for both theory and practice.
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Introduction

This paper reports on an on-going experiment in the School of Management at the University of Surrey whereby the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is being developed and promoted through a series of different interventions which, taken together, can be classified as organic in nature. The paper suggests that, given the nature of such scholarship, this is likely to be an appropriate approach to its development. The paper is organised in a fairly straightforward way. It begins with a brief discussion of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning which establishes a loose set of principles which may govern its development. The paper then discusses the theory of organic approaches to management and, on the basis of this theory, provides a conceptual framework through which it can be developed. The next section of the paper provides details of the School of Management’s approach and uses the conceptual framework as a mechanism to explain what has happened and why. Finally, the paper offers a discussion of some of the main lessons from this experiment for both theory and practice.

The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Discussion of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning began with Boyer’s (1990) work and the suggestion that explanations of the work of academics were limited and too heavily focused on research. For Boyer, “the meaning of scholarship [should be] creatively reconsidered” (p.13) and the aim of this consideration was the development of a Scholarship of Teaching which would bring “legitimacy to the full scope of academic work” (p.16). The main development since Boyer has been the
extension of the debate to encompass learning as well as teaching; Healey (2000), for example, suggests that it is useful to frame discussions of teaching in the context of an activity which makes learning possible. Much development in the field now focuses on the notion of knowledge about teaching and learning being the driving force behind scholarship, an idea supported by Paulson (2001) who suggests that two key elements are examining and interpreting practice. Kreber and Cranton (2000) suggest that knowledge of teaching and learning is the result of three different types of reflection by the scholar: There is reflection on content and what is taught, reflections on process and how things are taught and reflections on premise and why things are done in the way they are.

Whilst the literature on the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is rich and varied, one of its main characteristics is that there is no universal definition of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning which is accepted by all. Instead, there are a set of common characteristics which inform much of the literature. For the purposes of this paper, we would identify three issues which are useful to an understanding of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. First, there is more to it than simply what happens in a classroom setting and, similarly, it goes beyond a theoretical understanding of teaching and learning. For Boyer (1990), this was reflected in the notion of academics as “learners” (p.24) who are engaged in a constant process of reflection on their own practice as well as that of others. Similarly, Paulson (2001) identified the importance of investigating the relationship between teaching and learning and suggests that a well developed scholarship will lead to innovations in theory, an impact on practice and further scrutiny. The second characteristic is that a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is more of a behavioural and cultural
phenomenon than it is a departmental or managerial issue; Scholarship is not something that can be imposed or manufactured. For Trigwell et al (2000) this is reflected in the need for a teaching and learning “ethos” within schools, departments and institutions which further reinforces Boyer’s original point that teaching as an academic activity should be recognised, rewarded, scrutinised and justified in the same way as research. Finally, the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning involves the nurturing of communities of practices in order to “keep the flames of scholarship alive” (Boyer, 1990, p.24) which emphasises what Paulson (2001) describes as a need for sharing practice as much as examining and interpreting practice.

In discussing how a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning can be developed, Shulman (2000) suggests that it requires “serious investment” (p.49) on the part of both individuals and institutions. Despite the long term and complex nature of this investment, three reasons are provided as to why it is important. First, there are professional reasons based around the discipline specific and educational roles taken by academics. In many ways, the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning can act as a counterweight to the movement towards commodification and deprofessionalisation identified by Adcroft and Willis (2005). Second, there are pragmatic motivations based around the reflections on, and development of, the individual practices of academics. Finally, in a world of tuition fees, competition between institutions and, for instance, the National Student Survey, there are policy reasons as to why this is important. These are based around the growing demands for academics to justify what they do, how they do it and the quality of what is done to range of different stakeholders.
Whilst the literature is reasonably clear on why developing a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is a good idea, it is less prescriptive in terms of explaining how this can be done. A common theme which runs through the literature is that the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning requires activity at two levels. First, individual actions are undertaken by academics through which they become scholars in this area and, second, actions are required at the institutional level that will support and nurture the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Trigwell et al (2000) combine these two points of intervention and suggest that a clear focus is made on the communication and dissemination of good practice. This supports Bass’s (1999) view that any actions and practices which form part of the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning should be widely accessible for exchange and use. Healey goes further and suggests that scholarship is developed through rigorous investigations of teaching and learning and that this should focus on the interplay between research and the education of students. Across a broad cross section of literature, there is a clear rejection of top-down, mechanistic approaches whereby attempts are made to impose a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning on recalcitrant institutions (see, for example, Bernstein, 1996, Huber, 2001 and Shulman, 1999 and 2002). This paper argues that, under these conditions and assumptions, an organic approach to its development is most appropriate and we now turn to discuss such an approach.

**Organic Approaches: From theory to operating concept**

The discussion of organic approaches to management begins with necessary caveat that this is an underdeveloped area of management research. Whilst the literature can be traced back to the late 1970s (see, for example, Pierce and Delbecq,
1977 and Wedley and Ferrie, 1978) it remains an area that has not yet reached the mainstream of management theory and the result of this is that the literature tends to be eclectic, definitions of organic are diverse and lacking in universal acceptance and there are few, if any, operating concepts. This is both the biggest weakness and the biggest strength. It is a weakness because there is a limited theoretical and empirical base on which to build new research and action and, it is a strength, because it allows for a degree of risk taking and experimentation, both academically and practically, which more fully developed theories and concepts might not allow. What is crucial, therefore, is to have some kind of anchor for the discussion of an unfocused literature and we will focus on organic approaches in relation to strategy, structure and innovation.

In discussing the broad nature of strategy research, Chaharbaghi and Willis (1998) identify a number of opposing positions in mainstream strategy theory between, for example, prescription and emergence, market driven and organisational driven strategy and so on. Within this framework of strategy as a spectrum, where individual approaches fit somewhere between polar opposites, it is possible to locate organic approaches and, in doing so, identify key characteristics. For example, organic approaches are more likely to be driven by Mintzberg’s (1979) “operating core” or “middle line” that by the “strategic apex” of organisations and thus the role of senior management would be to facilitate rather than instigate strategy making. Hart (1992) sums up the position well when arguing that strategy should be “driven by organisational actors initiative … [senior management should] sponsor, endorse and support” (p.334). Within this theoretical paradigm, structure becomes important not because it is the main mechanism for the implementation of strategy but rather
because it is the means through which strategy is created. Slater and Narver (1995) suggest that if structure is going to have a crucial role in developing strategy, then amongst its many characteristics must be “decentralisation … fluid job responsibilities … extensive lateral communication processes … effective diffusion of knowledge” (p.69). Taken together, what this at least implies, is a fundamentally different relationship between strategy and structure than that suggested by, for example, Chandler (1962) who saw structure primarily as the servant of strategy.

With an organic approach, strategy and structure are essentially two parts of the same thing and the outcome is likely to be an improved chance of innovation as the organisation is encouraged to “experiment and take risks” (Hart, 1992, p.334). As strategy ceases to be a top down activity imposed on organisations, so too does it cease to be about grand plans or big schemes. Instead, it becomes a series of on-going, and possibly small, iterations which can, over time, transform organisations; “start an insurrection … build a coalition … win small, win early, win often” (Hamel, 2000, p.190-200).

The close relationship between strategy, structure and innovation in an organic approach to management suggests a number of benefits that should accrue to organisations which adopt it. Collier et al (2004), for example, see the benefits in the context of organisations which operate in complex and changing environments whereby an organic approach “improves an organisation’s skills and knowledge and increases its ability to adapt” (p.69). This perspective is reinforced by Farjoun (2002) who argues that increasing levels of adaptability are the product of changing managerial styles bought about by what we regard as organic approaches; “managers act in ways which are more allocentric, holistic, process oriented, entrepreneurial and
creative” (p.584). Perhaps the key issue in all of this is the growing involvement at all levels of an organisation which, for many, is fundamental to an organic approach. The notion of “commitment through involvement” (Hart, 1992, p.329) is the most common issue across the last three decades of literature on organic approaches to management and is seen as bringing two main benefits. First, it creates “a momentum to initiate innovation … facilitate idea and proposal generation” (Pierce and Delbecq, 1977, p. 35) and, second, such innovations are more likely to be embedded into organisational behaviours because “there is a higher level of participation in projects in which the findings are implemented” (Wedley and Ferrie, 1978, p.203).

Having established some theoretical underpinnings, we now turn to discuss the development of a conceptual operating model which fulfils two functions. First, it acts as a descriptive tool which will drive the narrative on the School of Management’s specific organic approach. Second, it has a more prescriptive role in terms of providing a broad outline as to how organisations can make a shift towards a more organic approach. In developing this model, we draw on six characteristics of organic approaches which are prevalent in the literature. First, in directional terms, it is much more likely to be a bottom-up process than it is a top-down process; strategy happens within organisations, it is not done to organisations. Second, and due to this bottom-up nature, strategy is more likely to be an emergent process with unclear outcomes than a mechanical process with a clearly defined goal in mind. Third, given the involvement across the organisation in the development of strategy, it is likely to deliver high levels of ownership of, and commitment to, decisions. Linked in with this, however, is the fourth characteristic that people should be prepared to take responsibility for change and innovation rather than just be given it or accept it. The
fifth characteristic is the view of organic approaches being a collection of small scale interventions across the whole organisation rather than a single large scale intervention from the top of the organisation. Finally, there is a requirement for high levels of trust between all organisational actors at all levels. On the basis of these characteristics, we have developed a four step model for the development and implementation of an organic approach.

The first step in the model is the identification of different elements of good practice across the organisation. Powley et al (2004) discuss this issue in the context of participation and suggest that the tone of the analysis should be “appreciative” with a focus on the “discovery of positive, enriching and sustainable practices” (p.69). The inevitability of this step is that the elements of good practice will vary in a number of a different ways. For example, they may vary in terms of size and the number of people involved, in intensity and the extent to which they are embedded in an organisation’s behaviour or in importance and their significance in a wider set of organisational goals. Figure 1 illustrates this step diagrammatically. Hamel (2000) sees this step as the starting point for a wider process of change and creativity and argues that the identification of individuals is as important as the identification of activities; “if you want to be a corporate citizen, rather than a subject, you’re going to have to be an activist” (p.155).

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Having established where the good practice is, the second step is to try and develop both informal and formal links between these elements in the organisation. The aim of these structures is to both recognise good practice and also to begin to disseminate and spread it throughout the organisation. Figure 2 illustrates this stage.
In keeping with Hamel’s perspective, Hage (1999) suggests that at this stage of development the two most important elements which must emerge are, first, an overall organisational structure which supports and promotes the organic approach and, second, “pro-change values” (p.601) which allow the approach to prosper.

**INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE**

The third step is in the widening and deepening of practices and relationships. At this point, the artificial structures created to link together islands of good practice are starting to be replaced by more organic structures as existing elements of good practice begin to merge together and new elements of good practice are fostered and identified. Figure 3 illustrates this stage. For Farjoun (2002), the nature of relationships within the organisation will begin to change at this point and become much more “reciprocal and interactive” (p.562) as links between activities and people become more organic, natural and informal.

**INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE**

The final step in the process, illustrated by Figure 4, is where attention shifts away from practice towards behaviour. At this stage, good practice is firmly embedded across the organisation and becomes part and parcel of everyday behaviour and so not need to be managed. At this stage, Collier et al (2004) suggest that “involvement is an important antecedent of healthy perceptions on strategy … it likely changes behaviour” (p.79).

**INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE**

The paper now turns to examine the experiences of the University of Surrey’s School of Management in its development of an organic approach to the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.
The School of Management experience

The University of Surrey’s School of Management was formed less than 10 years ago by the merger of two separate schools in the University. The merger brought together a traditional academic school (The School of Management for the Service Sector) and an enterprise unit (Surrey European Management School). The School currently runs seven undergraduate degree programmes with over 1,200 full time undergraduate students, just over half of whom study on a generalist degree in Business Management. The remaining undergraduate students in the School study on one of the School’s specialist degree programmes in areas such as tourism, hospitality and retail management. At postgraduate level, the School has almost 800 full time students on almost 20 degree programmes which, again, range from generalist to specialist programmes. Across the School as a whole, there are roughly 90 full time academics who work across three divisions and in a number of different subject groups according to their own area of specialism. The School of Management, along with the School of Law, is part of the Faculty of Management and Law, one of four faculties in the University as a whole. The School also has working relationships with centrally provided teaching and learning services through the University’s Centre for Educational and Academic Development (CEAD) and the Surrey Centre for Excellence in Professional Training and Education (SCEPTrE).

The organic approach adopted by the School has two main dimensions to it. On the one hand is the promotion and creation of individual activities which contribute to the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. These activities range from those initiated in the School to ones which originate at the
Faculty or University level. The second dimension to the approach is efforts to forge links and relationships between the different activities; central to the organic approach taken is the joining together of islands or pockets of good practice. Table 1 provides a summary of some the activities carried out in the School. The activities fall into three broad categories. First, student facing activities which are those activities whose primary purpose is to have a positive impact on the student experience in the classroom, lecture theatre or virtual learning environment. The activities include work carried out on Enquiry Based Learning and studies on student motivations, expectations and perceptions of feedback. The second category is staff facing activities which are those whose primary aim is staff development such as the University level Appreciative Inquiry and on-going work on staff development support for early career academics. Whilst all of the activities will have an impact on both staff and students, a number of them, such as work on e-learning, are specifically designed to be both staff and student facing and this is the third category of activity.

**INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**

By its nature, an organic approach will have many dimensions and, in a paper of this length, it is impossible to discuss all of them. We would, however, discuss three specific activities in order to better illustrate how the organic concept has been operationalised. The School’s organic approach is non-linear, it does not have a clear starting point or a definite end point, but a reasonable place to begin the discussion and explanation is the strategy away day held in early 2008. The aim of this event was to give momentum to the development of a Scholarship of Learning and Teaching and, in doing this, the away day served three functions. First, it was to establish a set of aspirations of teaching and learning for the Faculty as a whole. Second, it was to define a set of responsibilities and commitments on the part of both staff and students.
Finally, it was to create a set of actions to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the short, medium and long term. The first two of these functions were also aimed at directly informing the development of a Faculty teaching and learning strategy. In keeping with the organic ethos, the role of senior management in the Faculty was that of sponsor, rather than participant, and so the away day involved a cross section of academic staff from across the Faculty and a number of student representatives. The outcomes of this event were numerous and included a report which now forms the basis of the Faculty’s teaching and learning strategy. Perhaps the most significant outcome, in terms of direct impact across the School of Management, was the development of a Learning Partnership between the School and its students.

The School’s Learning Partnership was launched in September 2008 to all new undergraduates and postgraduates, some 1,200 students in total. At its core lies the assumption that students learn best when they have to work out issues for themselves which is a reflection of the wider University mission of promoting self-reliant and life-long learners. The main objective behind the Learning Partnership is to increase the focus of students on the development of their learning skills to complement the knowledge acquisition elements of their undergraduate and postgraduate degree studies. In developing this focus on skills, students are encouraged to spend time on directed self-reflection activities and to audit and monitor their progress in developing learning skills throughout their programme. This has been done in a number of ways such as face to face sessions, the use of self-testing instruments, exercises on issues such as time management, goal setting and visualisation and exercise work carried out in the School’s virtual learning
environment. Whilst the Learning Partnership has had a positive impact on the student experience, and has allowed for better integration between the goals of the university and the goals of its students, it has also raised specific issues such as the importance of motivation in understanding why and how students learn.

In keeping with a great deal of literature in the area (see, for example, Seibert 2002, Hancock 2002 and 2004, Militadou 2001 and Monetti 2002) work carried out on the Learning Partnership suggested that a key element to the development of learning skills amongst students was their motivations to learn and expectations of learning. As a complement to the Learning Partnership, therefore, a large scale study of the motivations to learn of undergraduate students has been carried out. This study involved almost 350 participants from all levels of the School’s undergraduate programmes and has been used, primarily, to inform decision making in areas such as assessment and feedback. The motivations study made use of the Motivated Strategies to Learn Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich et al (1991). Whilst all of these individual activities are important in their own right, their real value in an organic approach is how they are linked together. Figure 4 uses the conceptual model developed earlier to explain the nature of relationships between some of the activities discussed.

**INSERT FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE**

The paper now turns to discuss some of the implications for theory and practice of the School of Management’s experiences.

**Conclusion and Discussion**
We begin this final section with a discussion of the limitations of the paper. The first limitation concerns generalisability to other higher education institutions. The paper reports on one very specific example and, in doing so, makes use of theory to explain both what has happened and why it has happened in that way it has. It is probably unrealistic, therefore, for the paper to make any overarching claims as to the establishment or discovery of good or best practice for any context other than the one in which it is set. However, we would point out that the intention of the paper was to report on an interesting experiment in the development of teaching and learning rather than to produce a set of generalisable conclusions but, nevertheless, the experiences reported on are consistent with the general literature discussed on organisational change and more specific literature on the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Rather than suggest generalisability and all that it entails, we would make the basic point that, in any process of organisational change, there has to be a degree of congruence and fit between the context, process and outcome of that change. In the example in this paper, an organic approach was chosen because it best reflected not only the nature of the desired outcome (a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning) but also the nature, personality and idiosyncrasies of the School of Management. It is probably not unreasonable to suggest that these characteristics will be found, albeit in different blends, in many other academic departments in other higher education institutions.

A second possible weakness of the paper is that whilst it can report on what has happened and why, it is much more difficult to come to a judgement as to whether or not the process has been successful. This is for a number of reasons. The nature of the organic approach itself makes this a difficult issue to reconcile. The characteristics
of this approach means that it does not necessarily have an absolutely clear and identifiable starting point and, as a series of iterative and ongoing events, its end point can also be hazy and even non-existent. This means that, for example, there will always be problems in developing criteria on which progress can be measured especially when much of the outcome is intended to be behavioural or cultural in nature. It is, though, possible to gather different strands of evidence together which show that there have been significant, albeit gradual, changes taking place. In assessing outcomes, therefore, we would pose three questions. First, to what extent have staff been engaging with teaching and learning in a meaningful way? Second, to what extent have the different activities mentioned in the paper had an impact on both staff and students? Third, is there evidence that the overall quality of teaching and learning is improving across the school?

In judging whether staff have engaged with teaching and learning there are two specific problems. The first problem is that meaningful as a word is open to a variety of different interpretations. The second problem is that much engagement with teaching and learning is invisible to an observer; attendance or participation in an event is tangible but how that attendance or participation impacts on an individual’s practice and behaviour is frequently intangible. We know for certain that from a faculty of over 90 people, more than 70 people have participated in the 10 activities presented in Table 1. It is reasonable to suggest that if engagement is happening and the organic approach having an effect then these activities will be having an impact on, for example, the student experience. In this area, there is strong positive anecdotal evidence through, as illustrations, the development of e-learning where all modules taught in the school have developed a presence in the University’s virtual learning
environment, the Learning Partnership and a growing role for personal tutors in the
development and tracking of learning skills and changes in practice resulting from the
work on feedback, Enquiry Based Learning and teaching innovations. If nothing else,
the organic approach has provided a vehicle which has made good practice in
teaching and learning more visible. There is also more quantitative evidence from,
amongst other things, the University’s module evaluations and National Student
Survey results which suggests the quality of the student learning experience is on a
clear upward trajectory. It is, inevitably, impossible to tell how much of all this is a
direct result of the organic approach adopted but we would argue that the evidence on
involvement, impact and improvement suggests a link which is much more than
coincidence.

There are, therefore, a number of practical implications which are important
for both the development of a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning and the organic
approach undertaken. The first of these is that there would seem to be a significant
degree of value in driving change through a process that involves many small things
as opposed to a process that involves just one or two major interventions. Our
experiences suggest that this is beneficial because it better reflects how a Scholarship
of Teaching and Learning may look. There is a broad consensus in the literature
which suggests that a scholarship would occupy a spectrum with classroom practice at
one end and theory at the other and that its development would require actions across
all elements in between. The School of Management’s approach has, to date, had a
blend of activities which probably have a centre of gravity more in the direction of
practice than in the direction of theory although, as the organic approach develops and
becomes more embedded, we would expect to see ever closer linkages as practice
informs theory and theory informs practice. Small activities would seem to be an ideal way to build momentum through the involvement of ever more stakeholders in the process.

If one of the main objectives of all this activity is to alter behaviours and culture within the School, central to the approach has been the issue of trust and collegiality; given the nature of the organic approach and the importance of sharing across communities of practice in a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, this is a rather obvious point to make. In our experiences, trust has been central at two levels. First, trust matters between senior management and the main body of academic staff. If, for example, elements of strategy formulation are devolved to academic staff, it is vital that staff are trusted to create strategies and policies which are not only realistic and attainable but also a reasonable reflection of the school and university mission and wider objectives. Similarly, and in keeping with the literature, if staff take on this kind of responsibility they need to be able to trust that their input will be taken seriously and work in this area will be recognised, rewarded and valued. The second dimension to trust is between all stakeholders across the organisation, especially between academics and students. The School of Management’s experience has sought and gained significant input from students and the high levels of trust have allowed for a sensible balance to be struck between the students as a consumer who makes an increasing direct financial contribution to the School and the student as a learning partner.
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Figure 1: Step 1 in the development of an organic approach
Figure 2: Step 2 in the development of an organic approach

(2) BUILD LINKS
Figure 3: Step 3 in the development of an organic approach

(3) WIDEN AND DEEPEN
Figure 4: Step 4 in the development of an organic approach
Figure 5: Links Between Activities in the Organic Approach
Table 1: Summary of Selected Activities in the Organic Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Number of Staff</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciative Inquiry</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Identify and disseminate good practice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Staff Facing</td>
<td>Increased profile for teaching and learning, identification of good practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Strategic Away Day</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>Identify and disseminate good practice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Input into faculty teaching and learning strategy, Learning Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD Scholar</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>To promote the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>Increased profile for teaching and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Away Day</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Identify and disseminate good practice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>New policies and practices for PG programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strategy development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovations in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Learning</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Learning skills development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student Facing</td>
<td>New practices, Dissemination of new practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Innovations in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Partnership</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Learning skills development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Student Facing</td>
<td>Increased emphasis on student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiry Based Learning</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>Innovations in teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Student Facing</td>
<td>New practices, Dissemination of new practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations Study</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Identify and disseminate good practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Facing</td>
<td>Informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback Study</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Identify and disseminate good practice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Facing</td>
<td>Informed decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Support</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Staff Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Staff Facing</td>
<td>Identification of cross-university good practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>