

Transnational Pedagogy from Policy to Practice: Beginnings of the Journey

Ann Dashwood (dashwood@usq.edu.au) Faculty of Education
Jill Lawrence (lawrence@usq.edu.au), Faculty of Arts
Alice Brown (brown@usq.edu.au) Faculty of Education
and
Lorelle Burton (burtonl@usq.edu.au) Faculty of Science,
University of Southern Queensland, Australia.

This article has been anonymously peer-reviewed and accepted for publication in the *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning*, an international, peer-reviewed journal that focuses on issues and trends in pedagogies and learning in national and international contexts. ISSN 1833-4105.
© Copyright of articles is retained by authors. As this is an open access journal, articles are free to use, with proper attribution, in educational and other non-commercial settings.

Abstract

In 2005, the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) declared its vision to be *Australia's leading transnational educator*. To define and develop USQ's 'transnational pedagogy', the then Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice) initiated a consultative project team from across the university community, consisting of Excellence in Teaching Award winners and noted teachers nominated by their Faculties. This paper describes this attempt to operationalise the transnational agenda 'glocally' by considering the 'global' within 'local' contexts. A genealogical approach was used as a diagnostic tool to facilitate and problematise the stages along the journey. The approach involved consultation and collaboration, from the early stages of problematising and conceptualising transnational pedagogy to developing the USQ transnational framework of principles and strategies for learning and teaching. The six stages described in the paper include: problematisation, reflection on past and present practices, re-evaluation of truths, development of shared understandings, evolution of processes, and identification of future possibilities. The paper reports on these processes of collaboration and outlines how the conceptual framework of transnational teaching and learning was disseminated throughout the USQ community.

Key words:

transnational pedagogy, learning and teaching, communities of practice, flexibility, glocalisation

Note <transnational pedagogy co-used as multicultural pedagogy in relation to online education>

Introduction

In 2005, the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Southern Queensland (USQ) announced its vision to be *Australia's leading transnational university*. There are various interpretations and applications of the term 'transnational', so the incumbent Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice) initiated a consultative project team from across the university community to identify and develop a distinctive USQ 'transnational pedagogy'. This team comprised Excellence

in Teaching Award winners and noted teachers nominated by their Faculties. The aims of the team were two-fold: (a) to identify pedagogical practices that were 'transnational' in nature, and (b) to describe good practices in teaching and learning that exemplified 'transnational pedagogy' in an Australian tertiary institution.

This paper documents the project team's journey through the process of exploring uncontested knowledge and multiple perspectives in order to reach consensus for defining transnational teaching and learning (McWilliam, 2004). The formulation of a statement of principles and strategies as an outcome of this process was hoped to serve as the teaching mission of the University. This framework for transnational teaching and learning could then be examined through research to establish the values held by academics and students. The process of defining and redefining teaching and learning created not only another layer in assessing USQ pedagogy, but importantly, it enabled the legitimacy of the dominant assumptions to be re-problematised and new paradigms to be evolved. The whole-of-institution pedagogical approach outlined in this paper, both as a process and as a method, may prompt other higher education institutions to begin their own genealogical journeys.

Background

Managerial and administrative functions of a university are more likely to define its leadership than will the pedagogy it represents. Crowther and Burton (2007) argued that "traditional conceptions of University leadership, with their emphasis on strategic and managerial processes, are difficult to reconcile with developmental initiatives such as generation of an institutional pedagogy" (p. 11). But it was by adopting a distributed leadership approach, in this instance through pedagogical functions, that a new perspective is introduced to university decision making, by empowering staff to own the pedagogical process. Certain risks are involved in such a process, however, including the possibility that the vision could be wrong and that academics are directed to function on a flawed premise (Crowther & Burton). Nevertheless, leaving academics to function independently as in the past, without an explicit pedagogy, remains an alternative (Crowther & Burton).

There is an international trend towards enhanced teaching and learning effectiveness in universities. For example, Sorcinelli and Austin (2006, as cited in Crowther & Burton, 2007) cited Senge's (1990) concept of a "learning organization" as evidence when they discussed faculty development in North America. The most effective institutions for the future are those "that approach educational development as collaborative, community work" (Sorenson, 2006, p. 21) and are engaged in authentic teaching (Newmann, Secada, & Wehlage, 1995). However, responsibility of higher education through its teaching capacity to contribute to the quality of community life, democratic capacity, and connecting knowledge to public needs and opportunities was regarded as largely lost through the 1990s. Yet Holland (2005) claimed that engaged scholarship with engaged teaching and learning was "to be a force for institutional change and diversity" (p.12), with higher education expected to relate to the wider world.

The Australian Commonwealth Government introduced a number of reforms directed at the enhancement of university teaching, primarily through funding incentives, based on a range of outcomes criteria and related financial rewards (Rivers, 2004). There had been calls from universities elsewhere in Australia to recognise plans to

convert a “real world learning” vision into authentic student experiences (Young 2006, as cited in Crowther & Burton, 2007, p. 6):

We are turning the traditional learning model around. We will be delivering a practical problem for all students to start their studies with and through which students learn all their theoretical knowledge. So you engage students – they learn by doing things rather than being told things.

Methodology

This section will outline the evolving journey by (a) discussing the genealogical approach, (b) describing the selection of participants, and (c) analysing the processes and outcomes at each of the six stages.

Research Approach

A genealogical approach was used to facilitate the processes undertaken by the transnational project team. Genealogy is a relatively new methodological approach which attempts to conceptualise problems of the present in different ways from how traditional or revisionist histories have understood and described them (Macfarlane & Lewis, 2004). Michel Foucault (1986) introduced this method, distinguishing it from traditional history by insisting on its ability to affirm all knowledge as perspective. According to Foucault, genealogy became a way to write “the history of the present” – a diagnostic tool that foregrounds the cultural practices that have constituted us as subjects (as cited in Macfarlane & Lewis, 2004, p. 55).

Genealogy seeks to inquire into processes, procedures, and techniques through which truth, knowledge, and beliefs are produced (Meadmore, Hatcher, & McWilliam, 2000). This method places participants in an uncomfortable place in order that through shared dialogue, philosophical inquiry, and through exploration of concepts, values, and positions, they can become more comfortable. McWilliam (2004) suggested that the methodology allows particular problems to be viewed differently, as the approach is neither judgemental nor problem-solving, but one which encompasses a detached evaluation and assessment of particular problems whilst examining multiple perspectives.

The genealogical approach enabled participants in the project team to revisit a number of their uncontested ways of knowing: (a) in relation to pedagogical practices that were ‘transnational’ in nature, and (b) with regard to criteria for good practice in teaching and learning that exemplified ‘transnational pedagogy’ in an Australian tertiary institution. The process enabled the legitimacy of the present to be re-problematized, allowing established paradigms “to be dismantled or appear strange” when viewed by participants through this new lens (Meredyth & Tyler, 1993, p. 4). However, by engaging in this methodological process, participants discovered new individual and collective, hegemonic knowledge and understandings of transnational pedagogy.

The concept of ‘transnational pedagogy’ is problematic in that it has a number of different and conflicting meanings in the higher education (HE) context. The understandings of transnational vary from offshore teaching to cross-cultural teaching. The genealogical approach thus allowed the participants in the project team to develop and test ideas as a way of shaping a shared understanding of the concept of transnational pedagogy.

Participants

On November 17, 2005, former Minister for Education, Science and Training, Dr Brendan Nelson, announced the Transnational Quality Strategy (TQS) framework (Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs, 2005). Then USQ Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice), in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor, initiated defining the concept of transnational pedagogy for USQ and articulating its distinctive quality of teaching and learning, a vision that the University would offer Australian HE by 2010. A team of 12 participants, representative of a kernel of ideology and teaching experience were charged with bringing the concept into definable reality for USQ: To identify USQ pedagogy and make its principles and strategies explicit.

That many of the group were USQ Teaching Excellence Award winners also reflected moves in learning and teaching at the national level. In 2006, for example, The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (Carrick Institute, 2006) set benchmarks for university teaching quality, attributing quality to academic programs that were exemplars of the following four characteristics: (a) distinctiveness, coherence, and clarity of purpose; (b) positive influence on student learning and student engagement; (c) breadth of impact; and (d) concern for equity and diversity.

The Carrick Institute recognised that programs in the HE sector in Australia that were most highly acclaimed were those recognised by the quality of teaching in which objectives were clear and systems for implementation were effectively coordinated and evaluated (Carrick Institute, 2006). Student needs were targeted, and the overall enhanced learning experience for students was one of engagement. Programs were expected to provide a broad and positive impact on students, staff, and the institution. Equity and exclusivity were to be evident in terms of access, participation, and outcomes for diverse student groups. Those specific qualities form the core of quality teaching and learning. In 2006 and 2007 at USQ, 10 individuals and/or teams received Carrick Institute Citations for Outstanding Contributions to Student Learning while 5 individuals and/or teams received Carrick Awards for Australian University Teaching. Four members of the transnational team were both Carrick Citation and Award winners.

Qualities of transnational pedagogy are inherent in the Carrick awardees' teaching and learning philosophies and practices. Defining transparency of good practice in local and global contexts, as recognised by the Carrick Institute, and determining the extent to which USQ had those characteristics embedded in its programs at the teaching and learning interface, provided a focus for the transnational pedagogy journey.

Results and discussion

The group met several times throughout 2005 and 2006 for 2-hour sessions of face-to-face informal gatherings. Between meetings, electronic postings allowed the participants to review and reflect on their proposals. Ideas were proposed, shared, questioned, debated, recorded, and reviewed during the meetings. The process thus interconnected with the genealogical approach in that it sought to inquire into processes, procedures, and techniques through which knowledge is produced

(Meadmore et al., 2000; Williams, 2005). The genealogical approach adopted by the project team can be described in six stages: (a) Problematisation, (b) reflection on past and present practices, (c) re-evaluation of truths, (d) development of shared understandings, (e) evolution of processes, and (f) identification of future possibilities. Each stage is defined and its processes and outcomes outlined.

Stage 1: Problematisation

In this stage the problem (i.e., defining transnational pedagogy at USQ) is identified and isolated (Tamboukou, 1999, 2003). Knowledge assumptions of truth are subjected to inquiry and contested (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1998; Hook, 2001). Tamboukou (2003) argued that this stage is initiated by some kind of “socially shared ‘discomfort’ about how things are going” (p. 18).

Process: The first meeting of the transnational project team occurred in February 2005 and stemmed from the former Pro Vice-Chancellor’s proposal to the Vice-Chancellors’ Executive (VCEX) in November 2004. The concept of transnational pedagogy was problematised for the group, and the team set the task of developing the concept of transnational pedagogy and defining its principles and strategies as they pertained to USQ.

Outcomes: The project team accepted the rationale that:

1. The new USQ vision as *Australia’s leading transnational educator* explicitly promotes the concept of a balance of global/regional values in all aspects of our daily work. The implications for our professional practice were deemed worth teasing out.
2. The concept of *transnational education* manifests a responsible, futuristic concern for global well-being and sustainability – something that we care about very much and want to reflect as much as we can in our work.
3. The concept of *transnational pedagogy*, if we could create a picture of it, would potentially provide a very practical vehicle for clear communication regarding USQ’s distinctive mandate to all members of our community, particularly our students and prospective students.
4. We understand from authoritative recent research into successful educational improvement that heightened educational outcomes are inextricably linked to agreement about, and shared responsibility for, teaching, learning, and assessment processes.
5. A concept like *transnational pedagogy*, if we could possibly work it out, would provide a very meaningful basis for shared learning and professional development across all of our USQ Faculties and delivery systems.
6. Other universities around the world have attempted to develop institutional frameworks for international pedagogical processes, but none, to our knowledge, has been fully satisfied with the product of their efforts. At a time when all Australian universities are being challenged to explicate their pedagogical capabilities and practices, why would we not therefore accept this compelling challenge at this time?

At the end of the first meeting, the participants were asked to develop and circulate their own understanding of *transnational pedagogy*.

Stage2: Reflection on past and present practices

In this stage, the project team reflected on their past and present practices. In the genealogical approach, the aim is to question dominant discourses and/or understandings (Hook, 2001), in this case, transnational pedagogy. By tracing and exploring understandings at the site (the University) where ethics (rules and expectations) or styles of living (practices) interface (Williams, 2005), current understandings (uncontested truths, centres of power) are revealed, made transparent, and deconstructed. Williams (2005, p. 725) further suggested that it involves:

The drawing up of a *dispositif* showing the relationship to the ‘problem’ of the various phenomena constituting it; the latter should include any uncontested ‘truths’, all centres of power, and the bodies of any individuals involved as the site where their ethics (or style of living) interface with the world.

Process: For the project team, this reflective stage therefore required reviewing the literature on the concept of ‘transnational’, a step frequently revisited throughout the process as elements of transnational pedagogy claimed prominence.

Outcomes: There are two main strands emerging from the literature on transnational pedagogy. The first is a big picture view equating transnational pedagogy with good practice, inclusive teaching. The second restricts transnational to off-shore teaching. Jackson (2003) articulated the first understanding. According to Jackson, many Western universities are responding to the demands of globalisation by attempting to internationalise their curricula, that is, to introduce an element of multiculturalism. Jackson isolated three main assumptions in this process: (a) The globalisation process is a viable agenda for a sustainable and just future for all people; (b) it is the responsibility of the university to respond faithfully to current demands of western society, in this case, to the demands of globalisation; and (c) given the first two assumptions, internationalisation of the curriculum is a logical response. Jackson further argued that the first two assumptions need to be explicitly recognised and rigorously questioned to challenge the foundational concepts of contemporary western civilisation. In terms of this understanding, the core concepts of other cultures may be seen as an asset in this process, giving an entirely new meaning to the term ‘internationalisation of the curriculum’ (Jackson).

The University of South Australia (UniSA), an established transnational educator, proceeds from the assumptions put forward by Jackson (2003). At the UniSA, transnational education had become well established with Australian academics teaching cohorts of UniSA students in their local contexts, face-to-face, and off-shore. The meaning of transnational education at UniSA includes taking courses and programs overseas and teaching them there. Many of the current issues of teaching Australian courses offshore were paramount for academics teaching courses offered offshore with local tutors from participating partner institutions. For example, it was considered that cultural and educational experiences of students based in Asian countries required a wider range of expectations by both students and teachers, however teachers had to explain to students that “the process of learning is just as important as the content” (UniSA, 2007, p. 1) and that students have to be encouraged to engage with content and process as scholarly activity using their higher learning skills. Preparation of material, with meaningful assessment tasks, is coupled with an effort to “show empathy for your students, develop effective relationships with

students, stimulate the flow of ideas, and encourage, challenge, support, listen and model” (UniSA, p. 1). Successful transnational education at UniSA was based on those premises. It was not sufficient to replicate the textual material delivered in Australia.

Other Australian universities, however, have accepted the second, more traditional understanding of concept of transnational. Monash University has in place transnational quality assurance practices with institutions and companies abroad, thus seeing transnational and pedagogy as separate entities, equating transnational to meaning the location, off-shore. Shoemaker (2008) argued that Monash has gone farther down this transnational road than any other Australian university, expanding to include campuses in South Africa and Malaysia. The Monash approach is similar to that adopted by other Australian universities. For example, the University of Western Australia sees its offshore programs in terms of the impact of culture on learning, considering diverse student needs and capabilities, teacher perspectives, and determining how best to design and deliver appropriate learning materials and library services (Thompson, 2003).

Stage 3: Re-evaluation of truths

Questioning is fundamental to this stage, with the project team prioritising questions about ‘where are we’ and ‘where can we go’ (Henriques, Hollway, Urwin, Venn, & Walkerdine, 1998). For example, Williams (2005) talks of the need to continue to pose challenging questions with detachment and meticulous scrutiny, both textual and non-textual. This stage involves the privileging of ‘how’ over ‘why’ questions in the historical analysis of the ‘problem’, and a concentration on its ‘conditions of possibility’. According to Williams, “the exposure, by means of ‘effective history’, of the often destabilising and discontinuous *modus operandi* of discursive and other elements in the production of the ‘problem’ and its associated assumptions or ‘truths’” (p. 9).

Process: In the second meeting, the project team’s knowledge assumptions were subjected to further inquiry. Questions were fundamental, such as ‘which strand of research reflects the group’s evolving understandings of transnational?’ And, if the group were to take as its cornerstone the first view of equating transnational pedagogy with good practice, it was important to consider what this might mean for pedagogy at USQ. At UniSA, for example, Leask (2004) found that local staff offshore, from partner organisations, collaborated in the teaching support to visiting lecturers and the students. They usually shared the language and educational backgrounds of the students and were key mediators of the curriculum.

USQ confronts similar challenges to those faced by UniSA. Teachers have to manage heavy workloads and large classes, often within severe time constraints. They too are also required to build relationships with new students and bridge the ‘cultural gap’ between teachers and students. Content delivery has to be adapted for the offshore cohort, for example, by developing local insights and making instructions explicit and understandable. More effective communication skills are used to encourage interactivity in lectures and tutorials. Students are expected to boost their assertiveness and teachers are required to teach conventions of referencing so that students avoid plagiarism. Adequate resources to support student learning are thus essential to this process.

Outcomes: This questioning process contributed to the project team's understandings of transnational as exemplifying 'distributed leadership'. This stage achieved congruence by the team collaborating to define transnational pedagogy at USQ. Transnational was defined as "located", specifically "globally located" anywhere and everywhere that USQ students were studying USQ courses, either on-line, on-campus, or by distance education. The concept of USQ transnational also embraced locations across Australia. It began with local Toowoomba, trans-continent within Australia to reach interstate rural and urban locations, trans-continental to Asia, North America and Europe, and Trans-oceanic to the Pacific and island neighbours.

Stage 4: Development of shared understandings

Henriques et al. (1998) discussed the importance of arriving at a shared meaning that is fluid and evolving; of generating a new understanding developed from a conglomeration of shared discursive forms. Henriques et al. stated that "it is then possible to put together a new proposal for the present that takes account of all the different discursive forms which went into the making of the original concept" (p. 100).

Process: Having arrived at a shared meaning of transnational that was integrated with pedagogy and involved a cross-cultural experience, the project team set to define 'USQ pedagogy' in meaningful terms. This definition would need to apply across Faculties, and was to be equated with 'good teaching practice'. The team concurred that a fundamental principle was that 'good teaching practice' represents the pedagogy and that the agreed definition of 'transnational pedagogy' would need to be circulated to the University community for comment. A brainstorming technique was used to achieve these initial goals. Within the team, views were made known and supporting evidence identified. The following debate was often based on establishing priorities rather than rejections. When a concept had been sufficiently clarified, consensus was reached and it became part of that meeting's unfolding clarification of the pedagogy based on good practice among colleagues in the Faculties.

Outcomes: The learning and teaching goals identified by the project team included: showing respect for students, possessing a passion for teaching and learning, showing insight into existing skills and knowledge, clarifying student and teacher expectations, communicating effectively, actively engaging students in learning, providing a cross-cultural perspective, reflecting continuously on one's teaching, being open to change, and collaborating with colleagues. The definition of 'transnational' was redeveloped and ideas on the 'pedagogy' that best described good practice in the university were put forward. These ideas were categorised into two categories. First, the 'principles' of teaching practice were outlined. Second, the 'strategies' for implementing enhanced learning were described.

Stage 5: Evolution of processes

Hook (2001) argued that the last principle of genealogical methodology is exteriority. Thus, "that in analysis the apparent meaning of a discourse must give way before the external conditions of its possibility" (Hook, p. 538). Williams (2005) maintained that this stage is a combination of detachment and meticulous scrutiny in the analysis of the problem's discursive manifestations.

Process: This stage positioned strategic teaching as exemplifying USQ principles of pedagogy. To disseminate the pedagogy to the broader USQ community, the proposed USQ transnational principles and strategies were presented at a number of USQ forums, seminars, and meetings through 2005 and 2006. They were also presented to an international forum and through consultation and research meetings held by the research team in 2007.

In the first stage of dissemination, the academic community met to discuss the principles raised as an approach to teaching and learning. This was seen as an initial step to obtain the University's endorsement and embed the principles and strategies as the basis of transnational pedagogy at USQ. The group felt that putting principles into practice required exemplars of good practice as a means of defining each stage. Group members were required to provide evidence of good practice for which they had been formally acknowledged. As a result, exemplars of best practice emerged across the various disciplines.

The USQ common hour was chosen for communicating the schema of principles and strategies to the wider academic community for their endorsement. The forum goals were two-fold: (a) To present the concept to the academic community that had received previous endorsement in principle from the VCEX, and (b) to outline the journey of identifying a transnational pedagogy framework for the University. The first presentation took the form of a team approach. Key concepts of the paper were initially defined, with exemplars added to provide discipline-specific input. Individuals in the audience were then invited to provide input, providing personal exemplars of teaching and learning practices and raising questions about the efficacy of the stated vision. Written comments were canvassed and the feedback collated. A small subgroup reviewed the written assessments and responses.

A second presentation was made to an international forum in December 2005 by then Pro Vice-Chancellor (Regional Engagement and Social Justice), with break-out groups including team members. The concepts encapsulated an orientation to strategic teaching rather than a prescription for ways in which specific disciplines might implement each strategy.

Outcomes: At each public forum, essential characteristics of the major principles were elaborated with the view to identifying teaching strategies that would give authenticity to the principles. In this way, the principles and strategies of transnational pedagogy were re-problematised for newcomers. These newcomers were often key stakeholders (e.g., USQ policy makers). Feedback, often questioning and sometimes hostile, was received at each presentation of the transnational principles and practices. A major concern was that the notion of 'transnational' was seen as a shift in University priority from local to global orientation of student needs. Concern was expressed that the image presented should not be the definitive direction for USQ. Secondly, it was believed that a documented statement of a 'transnational pedagogy' would not be sustained in practice and that such a document could be held in contempt if evidence was provided showing that the university did not meet its marketed image.

As a consequence of these negotiations, the principles and strategies developed by the initial project team have evolved. The following principles, evolved through the

stages of inquiry described in this paper, were used in a 2007 survey of learning and teaching practices at USQ:

1. *The Sustainability Principle*: USQ embraces the ability to meet present needs within a code of ethical practice without compromising the ability to meet future needs.
2. *The Engagement Principle*: USQ fosters engagement and collaboration. Engagement means participating in interactive exchanges of knowledge. Collaboration means working creatively in partnerships: student-to-student and teacher-to-student.
3. *The Scholarship Principle*: USQ respects diverse learning and teaching styles and upholds excellence and integrity of scholarship across disciplines.
4. *The Flexibility Principle*: USQ accepts individual and collective responsibility in providing supportive, inclusive, and flexible learning environments.
5. *The Contextual Principle*: USQ recognises and values students' backgrounds and contexts.

In order to achieve clarity in communicating the strategies to the wider academic community, the nine original strategies were also collapsed into the following seven.

1. Caring.
2. Valuing difference.
3. Contextualising learning experiences and assessment.
4. Explicitly communicating discipline knowledge and expectations.
5. Developing reflective practitioners.
6. Valuing what is already known, extending it and projecting it into the future.
7. Facilitating two-way problem-solving.

The transnational pedagogy project team reconvened following the presentations to the wider University community to determine ways of embedding transnational pedagogy into future teaching protocols and practices. The principles and strategies were subsequently presented to the USQ and international forums. A position paper was presented to University Council and was endorsed in November 2005. It received unanimous endorsement by VCEX on July 6, 2006 (USQ, 2006) and was written into the USQ vision statement that in appeared on the USQ homepage in 2007.

Stage 6: Identification of future possibilities

Williams (2005) suggested that the final stage involves the opening up of future possibilities and political choices as a direct result of the analysis of the problem. Future considerations are both for society and for the subject/self as an individual focus of knowledge, process, and ethics. New problems are to be identified and isolated (Tamboukou, 2003) and later contested (Henriques et al., 1998).

Process: For the project team this final stage involved making choices about whether to proceed with the process, its dissemination, implementation, and research. For some participants, this stage marked the end of their involvement, although papers were presented to international conferences during the following year. Others withdrew from the group. The endorsement of the transnational pedagogy meant new concerns were problematised for the remaining participants. Tamboukou's (2003, p. 18) "socially shared 'discomfort' about how things are going" was re-established in relation to three key areas: dissemination, implementation, and research. The

following issues were identified:

1. Extensive university-wide professional development would be required to familiarise staff with the rationale for transnational pedagogy and to develop familiarity with the seven strategies.
2. There was no precedent at USQ for an organisation-wide initiative based on the concept of 'alignment'. It was not part of the conscious academic thinking at USQ and may have been contrary to some discipline-based thinking and some perspectives on academic freedom and autonomy.
3. Workload issues were likely to arise when staff engaged in collaborative planning and collaborative professional learning.
4. Reward systems would need to have aligned with Carrick Institute awards for staff who demonstrated success in implementing the University vision through their pedagogical practices.
5. There was a 'risk' factor if the University vision was 'wrong' (Crowther & Burton, 2007).
6. While the virtues of alignment and authenticity were recognised and valued by the University's marketing managers, the marketing division had historically created its own marketing strategies, including underlying values, without input from academic staff. The issue of whether the concept of transnational was sufficiently appealing to enrolled and potential students to justify use in the University's marketing strategy remained an unanswered dilemma.
7. Moreover, there was the issue of whether it was mandatory for the University's pedagogical framework to be included as a basic ingredient of the University's marketing strategies (Crowther & Burton, 2007). USQ marketing investigations of the role of value-adding in the market have found that connectedness to the institution was an imperative in students' decision-making. (Olton, personal communication, 2007)

Outcomes: The Director of the Centre for Research in Transformative Pedagogies was invited to respond to the University-endorsed statement on transnational pedagogy. The research centre was to give a priority to research related to transnational pedagogy. The outcomes included a research plan. A grant was approved for the Early Childhood program to conduct funded research, collecting evidence of the community's understanding of notions surrounding transnational pedagogy related to their program.

Early in 2007, Dr Burton called a research meeting to gather, from around the university, individual and collective interest in the notion of surveying transnational pedagogy. One group, focussed around the Early Childhood grant, developed a survey instrument to be used in semesters two and three to gather a university wide concept from students and staff about the value, frequency, and extent to which learning and teaching at USQ is transnational. The survey items were based on the principles outlined.

The early childhood group, Robert White and Alice Brown from the Faculty of Education, collaborated with Dr Lorelle Burton, Faculty of Sciences, Dr Ann Dashwood, Faculty of Education, and Dr Jill Lawrence, Faculty of Arts, from the Centre for Research in Transformative Pedagogies to develop the early childhood research project and extended it to all USQ students and academics. Two versions of

the survey were developed: student and academic staff. The survey was to be administered online. Ethics approval was sought and obtained, and the student survey was disseminated in September 2007. The data are currently being investigated.

Conclusion

The journey of the project team in using the genealogical process to define the concept of 'transnational pedagogy' was both troubling and rewarding. It caused participants to question understandings of key principles. The genealogical approach helped to question those pedagogical practices that were 'transnational' in nature. It also raised questions of identifying good practice in teaching and learning that exemplified 'transnational pedagogy' in an Australian tertiary institution. The genealogical approach further guided the concept of transnational at USQ to assume a 'glocalised' orientation, with principles of the pedagogy remaining fundamental to the orientation: teaching practices and learning endeavours have to be sustainable, engaging, scholarly, flexible, and contextualised.

Therefore the University has an educational vision that underpins its mission and values in the local and global world of Education. Sectors of the journey thus far have involved disseminating the pedagogy to Faculty members, identifying transnational practice within existing University frameworks and shaping research tools to inform transnational practice.

The ongoing transnational journey involves establishing the University's teaching practices around five principles and seven strategies. It involves unfolding those five strategic principles and embedding them into course materials to reflect the roles of teachers, learners and the selected materials in an era of faster technological advances. As the principles and strategies of transnational pedagogy are put into practice, the University will become distinctive in the Australian higher education sector for the transnational pedagogy it constructs. The future journey will be prospective, based on a process of introspection, analysis, integration, innovation and improvement (USQ, 2006). Research findings within the University and with international partners will continue to inform the transnational pedagogy genre. A pilot study of USQ students and academics will provide the catalyst for assessing the framework. A key question is to determine how teachers recognise in their practices the principles of transnational teaching and learning and to understand the extent to which students perceive the pedagogy benefits their learning.

References

- Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education. (2006). *Carrick Awards for Australian University Teaching: Awards for programs that enhance learning: Promoting and advancing learning and teaching in Australian higher education*. Retrieved August 30, 2007, from <http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go/home/awards/pid/60>
- Crowther, F., Behjat, N., Birch, D., Brodie, L., Burton, L., Connors, B., Cretchley, P., Dashwood, A., Hoey, A., Brown, A., Locke, J., Maroulis, J., Smith, A. and Wood, D. (2005). *Transnational pedagogy: A stimulus paper for consideration by the USQ professional community*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba, Australia.

- Crowther, F., & Burton, L. (2007, April). *Aligning organisational vision and academic practices: Implications for University strategic planners*. A keynote presentation at the Knowledge Partnerships Conference on Higher Education: International Markets, Internal Dynamics, Cambridge, United Kingdom.
- Foucault, M. (1986). Nietzsche, genealogy and history. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault reader* (pp. 101-120). London: Penguin.
- Henriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, G., & Walkerdine, V. (1998). *Changing the Subject: psychology, social regulation and subjectivity*. London: Routledge.
- Holland, B.A. (2005). Scholarship and Mission in the 21st Century University: The Role of Engagement, *AUQA Occasional Publication Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum 2005*, p. 11
- Hook, D. (2001). Discourse, knowledge, materiality, history: Foucault and discourse analysis. *Theory and Psychology*, 11(4).
- Jackson, M.G. (2003) Internationalising the University Curriculum. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 27 (3), 325 – 340. Retrieved 22 May 2008, <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~content=a715702473~db=all>
- Leask, B. (2004, July). *Transnational education and intercultural learning: Reconstructing the offshore teaching team to enhance internationalisation*. Paper presented at the Australian Universities Quality Forum: Quality in a Time of Change, Adelaide, South Australia.
- Macfarlane, K., & Lewis, T. (2004). Childcare: Human services or education: A genealogical approach. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 5(1), 51-67.
- Macfarlane, K., & Lewis, T. (2004). Childcare – Human Services or Education: a genealogical approach. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 5(1), 51-67.
- McWilliam, E. (2004). W(h)ither Practitioner Research? *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 31(2), 113-126.
- Meadmore, D., Hatcher, C., & McWilliam, E. (2000). Getting tense about genealogy. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 13(5), 463-476.
- Meredyth, D., & Tyler, D. (Eds.), (1993). *Child and citizen: Genealogies of schooling and subjectivity*. Brisbane, Australia: Griffith University Institute for Cultural Policy Studies.
- Ministerial Council on Education, Employment, Training and Youth Affairs (2005, November). *Delivering first class international education and training*. Paper presented by Minister for Education, Science and Training, The Hon. Dr Brendan Nelson, at Joint ministers' communiqué, Canberra, Australia. Retrieved November 27, 2007 from http://www.mceetya.edu.au/verve/_resources/MC19_joint_communique.pdf
- Newmann, F. M., Secada, W. G., & Wehlage, G. G. (1995). *A guide to authentic instruction and assessment: Vision, standards, and scoring*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.
- Olton, I. (2007). *Personal communication*, 12th September.
- Rivers, J. (2004, April 6). Quality teaching comes under spotlight, *Campus Review*, p. 5.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Shoemaker, A. (2008) *If the World is our Campus, Where are We Going?* Retrieved November 27, 2007 from <http://www.monash.edu.au/teaching/passport/paper.html>

- Sorenson, L. (2006, April). Educational development in the USA. *HERDSA News*, pp. 19-21.
- Tamboukou, M. (1999). Writing genealogies: an exploration of Foucault's strategies for doing research. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education*, 29(2), 201-217.
- Tamboukou, M. (2003). *Women, education and the self: a Foucauldian perspective* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Thompson, E. (2003). New partners in learning: An effective teaching and learning framework for offshore students. In *Partners in Learning*. Proceedings of the 12th Annual Teaching Learning Forum, 11-12 February 2003. Perth: Edith Cowan University. <http://lsn.curtin.edu.au/tlf/tlf2003/abstracts/thompson-abs.html>
- University of South Australia. *Transnational teaching: An overview*. Retrieved November 21, 2007, from <http://www.unisanet.unisa.edu.au/learningconnection/staff/practice/transnational-overview.asp>
- University of Southern Queensland. (2006). *USQ equity update 2006*. Retrieved June 4, 2007, from The University of Southern Queensland web site: <http://www.usq.edu.au/planstats/planning/docs/USQEquityUpdate2006.doc>
- Williams, A. (2005). Genealogy as methodology in the philosophy of Michel Foucault. *London Foucault Circle* Retrieved May 15, 2008, from http://www.uel.ac.uk/cnr/documents/GenealogyasMethodologyinthePhilosophyofMichelFoucault_001.doc
- Young, I. (2006, July 19). Swinburne rewrites its curricula. *Campus Review*, p. 5.