

Academic Development and its Practitioners

A View from the Inside



Editor
Gert Young

Abbreviations

APQ	Academic planning and Quality Assurance
BLC	Blended learning coordinator
CHE	Council for Higher Education
CHEC	Cape Higher Education Consortium
CLT	Centre for Learning Technologies
CoP	Community of practice
CTL	Centre for Teaching and Learning
DHET	Department of Higher Education and Training
DLTE	Division for Learning and Teaching Enhancement
DRD	Division for Research Development
ECAs	Early Career Academics
FIGs	Focused Interest Groups
FIRLT	Fund for Innovation and Research in Learning and Teaching
FMF	Fees Must Fall
FYA	First-Year Academy
GAs	Graduate Attributes
HE	Higher Education
HEIs	Higher Education Institutions
HELTASA	Higher Education Learning and Teaching Association of Southern Africa
HEQC	Higher Education Quality Committee
HoD	Head of Department
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
LC	Language Centre
LCT	Legitimation Code Theory
NAA	Newly appointed academics
NRF	National Research Foundation
PASS	Professional and Administrative Support Services

PGDip	Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education
PL	Professional learning
PREDAC	Professional Educational Development for Academics
REEP	Recommended Engineering Education Practices
SAHEI	South African Higher Education Institution
SAS	Student Academic Support Services
SoEL	Scholarship of Educational Leadership
SOTL	Scholarship of Teaching and Learning
STEM	Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics
SU	Stellenbosch University
T&L	Teaching and Learning
UBC	University of British Columbia
UniEd	Division of University Education

"WE HAVE WIND IN OUR SAILS"

Enablers that moved teaching and learning towards the centre of what is valued at Stellenbosch University

Nicoline Herman & Antoinette van der Merwe

We dedicate this chapter to Prof Jan Botha

... you had the vision, you spoke the vision, you represented the vision ...

1 Introduction

Teaching in Higher Education (HE) has become increasingly important and complex and doing it well involves having appropriate and extensive knowledge and skills (Hutchings, Huber & Golde, 2006). Based on the challenges and changes in HE, the value of good and excellent teaching by good and excellent lecturers is non-negotiable. Teaching undergraduate students is however only one of the roles of an academic – a role which is not always highly valued by research-intensive universities and one for which academics are often not adequately prepared (Viskovic, 2009; Cilliers & Herman, 2010). Furthermore, teaching in HE is often seen as a non-professional and unscholarly art or craft for which no professional learning (PL) is necessary, and which everybody can do (Johnston, 1998). Bringing about change in the status of teaching and learning (T&L) in Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) is often a complex endeavour as it usually needs to alter the inherent culture of the institution (Van Schalkwyk, Leibowitz, Herman & Farmer, 2015).

Values and beliefs are immanent aspects of culture and are drivers of change in organisations (Kezar & Eckel, 2002). In his book, *Change leadership in higher education: A practical guide to academic transformation* (2015), Buller advises that change initiatives in HEIs should be approached differently from those in other organisations and should fit the unique organisational culture of HEIs. He suggests that change in HEIs should be intentionally led, instead of only be managed (Ibid, p. 24). According to Gill (2002:310), for change to happen, it is necessary to have a vision, to design strategies to make the vision a reality and to ensure a shared focus amongst everybody – a process he called "emotional alignment". The role of institutional leaders as change agents and creators of enabling spaces for change, specifically related to the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role, is thus of utmost importance (Leibowitz, 2014; Buller, 2015; Van Schalkwyk, et al., 2015).

Researchers have previously reported that an enabling context for T&L and the PL of academics for their teaching role, will take T&L seriously and place it at the centre of the university's intellectual life, accompanied by the necessary resources (Rowland & Barton, 1994; Murray & Macdonald, 1997). Other scholars have indicated that an enabling context is a space where teaching (and lecturers) can flourish; where teaching is valued by peers and those in power (McKinney, 2006; Buller, 2015); where lecturers get the opportunity "to talk seriously about teaching and learning, have ideas [about teaching and learning] listened to and taken seriously, [can] slow down for a moment and reflect, be recognised by peers as contributing to an important larger enterprise" (Hutchings, 2000:65); and where issues of workload and time are attended to (Dunkin, 2001). To create such enabling environments in HEIs, changes are usually required on multiple levels, including the structural, human resource, political and symbolic levels (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Leibowitz & Adendorff, 2007).

According to Kezar and Eckel (2002), context-based research would assist in understanding why and under what circumstances change takes place in HEIs. Change is understood to be pervasive, thus affecting numerous offices and units across the institution; deep, thus touching upon values, beliefs, structures, and human and other resources; intentional; and occurring over time (Eckel, Hill & Green, 1998). Gill (2002:308) stated that "[c]hange, by definition, requires the creation of something [different], which in turn demands leadership". The commitment of senior institutional leadership to change would, according to Gill (2002:308), be evident in several ways: Their unequivocal acceptance of ownership and responsibility for the success of the change initiative, an eagerness to be involved, a willingness to invest resources and to take tough decisions when required, an awareness of the impact of their own behaviour, sending a consistent message, and regular reviews of progress.

The study reported on in this chapter explored the journey of the teaching and learning function and the professional learning (PL) of academics for their teaching role at Stellenbosch University (SU) from 1998 to 2018, to determine changes in the status thereof over time. It did so by using Bolman and Deal's (2008) four-frame typology (structural, human resource, political and symbolic) as lenses to uncover the institutional enablers and constraints within the continuous journey of change over the twenty years. The timespan of this research coincides with changes that took place in the country, within HE nationally and at the institution, and aligns with the 'democratic era' as described by Botha in a chapter in the SU Centenary publication, *Stellenbosch University 1918-2018* (Botha, 2018:223).

In an unorthodox move, the chapter firstly describes the historical and current contexts of the institution by interweaving information from institutional documentation and data from interviews done for this study. The interview data included in the description of the context gives historical information and supports the notion of movement that took place over the 20 years under investigation. Subsequently the methodology and analytical framework are discussed followed by the reporting and discussion of the data and findings from the interview data that shed light on the enablers of this movement. The reporting and discussion are done according to three phases that coincide with structural changes at the institution, i.e. the *Establishment phase* (1998-2003), the *Structurally stepping backwards, but resiliently pushing forward phase* (2003-2013) and the *Intentionally embedding scholarly teaching within faculties and creating a continuous trajectory of professional learning phase* (2013-2018).

2 Historical and current institutional context

Stellenbosch University is a medium-sized research-intensive university, recognised among the top HEIs in South Africa (SA) (Stellenbosch University, n.d.). In support of a historical institutional decision, inclusive of a comprehensive strategy and a five-point action plan to drive the research function at the institution (Botha, 2018:220), the *Strategic framework for the turn of the century and beyond* (2000:11) states that "...the University's aspiration [was] to be a research orientated university of world standing". This was accompanied by a research vision which stated that the university strived to become "[a] strongly research-orientated university, sought-after for the training of quality researchers, who are acknowledged as world leaders of research in selected niche areas" (Ibid, p.12). The same strategy document stated the vision for teaching and learning as "[a] university characterised by quality teaching, by the constant renewal of teaching and learning programmes and by the creation of effective opportunities for learning/study" (Ibid, p.12). At the time, only research was valued and had traditionally been used to advance the careers of academics. As part of a national government initiative, the university was audited by the Higher Education Quality Committee (HEQC) of the Council for Higher Education (CHE) in 2005. The audit mainly focused on quality assurance policies and processes and the report was largely favourable. It did however state that "[a]cademics themselves suggested that the institution as a whole values research over teaching and learning" (HEQC, 2007:20). The report also indicated that "the prioritisation of research as an institutional focus has given teaching and learning a subordinate position in the institution". The report further stated that the SU mission was "imprecise in relation to teaching [which] ... not only [reflected] indirectly in academic staff attitudes towards teaching but it is also concretely reflected in the size of the budgets of the academic units and especially in the budgets of the academic support units". The report further noted "the unclear position of the committee for learning and teaching (*Committee for Learning and Teaching*) in the academic governance of the institution" (Ibid, p.21).

Previous institutional research and anecdotal evidence also pointed to a situation where teaching was subordinate to research and that lecturers focusing their time and energy on teaching was not valued (Herman, 2015; Van Schalkwyk, et al., 2015). Data from this study confirm these findings. One interviewee in this research project, for example, referred to a first-hand experience of this unfortunate situation when a senior person referred to T&L as an un-rideable horse with the interviewee as the jockey:

The jockey is OK, but it's a horse that nobody can ride. (Drew, referring to the year 1998)

Data from this study however also indicate that since the late ninety-nineties, there were movements and the context and culture have indeed changed and the status of T&L at the institution has indeed improved. Many initiatives like, for example, T&L awards, small T&L grants, etc., (as discussed later) became more visible and one interviewee enthusiastically proclaimed:

... there has been a shift...there's [been] movement ... the growth ... has been phenomenal" (Kris), resulting in a more enabling, appreciative and rewarding attitude and culture towards the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role, because "... the institution ... reached a level, it was kind of ready for that. (Kris)

Another interviewee aptly summarised this change as follows:

I think there had been a whole lot of factors that have brought us to a place where we... [in 2018] accepted a T&L Policy that verbalizes all these things that 10 years ago, I don't think we even understood sufficiently to write them down on a piece of paper. So, it's not to say that there wasn't concern for T&L then. It was also the context ... at the university, the national, the international ... none of us were there. (Sam)

The value of policies as a "kind of shining a light into a dark forest" was also emphasised by one interviewee:

...it was almost as though the institutional space, the policies or whatever was kind of shining a light into a dark forest. It was suddenly lighting spaces that people didn't know existed and then we were there as guides to help people navigate now that they see, hang on, I kind of see we need to be there. (Pella)

To emphasise that this process has been a journey over time, the metaphor of energy-saving bulbs that do not give a lot of light when originally switched on, but become brighter as time passes, was used by one interviewee to describe how the stature of T&L "... was not that strong, but ... things have started changing and ... if we look at it today, I think that light is shining quite brightly ... I think we moved, we progressed, we improved" (Lee).

Three interviewees in this study linked the change in stature to the fact that over the years many young academics, who are now in leadership and management positions, have been exposed to T&L enhancing initiatives and are creating a 'tipping point' for a change in culture. Staff turnover where these young academics have replaced older academics, is therefore seen as an enabler in the observed changes as "... some of the old dogs have moved out of the system and I don't think you would be able to change many of them" (Drew).

A number of interviewees linked the change in T&L culture to this critical mass of individuals who had developed insights into, and an appreciation for, T&L and are now coming into senior positions:

Personally, I think we've reached a tipping point at the university where there's more people with a vested interest or an understanding of ... T&L and that is why the culture is now changing. So, people who are now professors ... who are heads of departments, those sorts of roles, ... there's enough of those senior people who have come through the various [T&L] initiatives over the years who now, because of that, have the insight that they are now exercising ... at this more senior level. (Jesse)

I'm just wondering ... the leaders in the faculties now, how many of them are actually people who have come up through the ranks so to speak, started in PREDAC 20 years ago ... I think an enabler must have been that turnover of staff. (Pella)

So how many of those people are now in those spheres of influence so that a particular policy not only will get accepted, but will get implemented. (Sam)

Other interviewees attributed the cultural changes that took place to many years of "laying a solid foundation..." (Kris) and doing the hard, preparatory work that enables us to "now see the fruits of policy development over 20 years" (Drew). Another interviewee referred to the "... many seeds [that] have been planted over the 20-year period, possibly in ground that has become increasingly fertile for T&L to take root ... as [previously] I just don't think the institutional climate, the people, were ready for those initiatives to actually take root and start growing" (Sam). One interviewee also reminded us that change is a process of growth and experience:

... if we knew then what we know now, but we only know now what we know because we've been through that history. (Pella)

The sense of growth over time was also supported by an interviewee who indicated that at this stage, "... I think we [are] fortunate that we [now] have wind in our sails in a few ways" (River).

The impact of what was happening in the national and international arenas, on institutional change and initiatives can also not be disregarded as it "...created massive awareness" and "boiled down to the real day-to-day work" (Pella). Interviewees referred to some of these external enablers and the following quotes are examples of these comments:

... the Quality Enhancement Project ... nationally played a big role in foregrounding T&L matters and I am interested to see what their next round of institutional audits and the focus on student success is going to do around T&L ... and I always believe very strongly, [to] use [these external triggers] because they won't come around all the time. (Lee)

... the big thing today would be the whole Fees must Fall (#FMMF) analogy and to what extent that makes people more or less receptive to any given initiative. (Pella)

Against this backdrop of the changes that took place at the institution, this research project aimed to uncover and understand the institutional enablers over the past twenty years, that 'provided the wind in the T&L sails' that brought about these changes and moved the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role from the periphery towards the centre of what is valued and supported at the institution.

3 Methodology

A qualitative research project investigating the enablers that supported the movement of T&L towards the centre of the institution was undertaken. The two researchers are staff members from the Professional and Administrative Support Services (PASS) environment involved in T&L and the PL of lecturers for T&L for the past twenty years. As insiders our perspectives and interpretations of the institutional T&L environment most certainly influenced the research design and the findings. Within the position of simultaneously being an "insider or outsider, both [of these] or neither [of these]" (Mullings, 1999:337), we have however attempted to be objective and critical during the analysis of, and reporting on, the data.

During this study, institutional documentation was analysed and semi-structured interviews were conducted with seven individuals who were in T&L related management positions in the PASS environment between 1998 and 2018. Ethical clearance and institutional permission were obtained and all interviewees gave written consent for the interview data to be used in

an anonymised way. In the chapter, pseudonyms are therefore used when referring to the interviewees to protect their identities. All interviews were transcribed and thematically coded according to the four-frame typology of (Bolman & Deal, 2008).

3.1 Bolman and Deal's four-frame typology

The Bolman and Deal's four-frame typology is described as "... the most familiar way ... of re- examin[ing]" what academic leaders do in terms of "leading effective change in higher education" (Buller, 2015:39). This typology (Bolman & Deal, 2008) incorporates multiple perspectives and was thus used as an analytical framework to analyse the data and answer the research question, i.e.: What were the institutional enablers that brought about change and enabled the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role to move from the periphery towards the centre of what is valued and supported at the institution?

The four-frame typology describes four frames or lenses, through which to view institutional initiatives and actions namely the structural, human resource, political and symbolic. Each of the four frames is simultaneously powerful and coherent and collectively, they provide clarity about the institution in terms of the four lenses. The table below is adapted from Buller (2015) and provides central concepts for each of the four frames.

Table 1.1 Overview of Bolman and Deal's four frame model

FRAME				
	Structural	Human Resource	Political	Symbolic
Central Concepts	Rules, roles, goals, policies, technologies, environment.	Needs, skills, relationship.	Power, conflict, competition, organisation, al politics.	Culture, meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, heroes.

The *structural frame* concentrates on the architecture of the institution – the creation of units, committees, policies and strategies, roles, rules, lines of authority, etc. Structures should support the vision of the institution and facilitate relationships. Coordination and control are integrated for effectiveness. This frame is mostly used by leaders and managers to bring about change. The *human resource frame* emphasises caring for, and understanding people, their strengths and weaknesses, their reasoning and emotions, desires and fears. It views people as an investment and as vital resources for reaching the vision of the institution. Employees need to feel valued, cared for, supported and provided with opportunities for professional learning (PL). This in turn will create trust which enables motivation, creativity, innovation, risk taking and engagement. The *political frame* recognises institutions as competitive arenas of scarce resources, competing interests, and struggles for power and advantage. It has an appreciation for the complexity and tensions underpinning educational work while advocating and scanning for opportunities and nurturing support networks and linkages. It aims to get 'buy-in' by integrating ideas into the heads and hearts of those involved. This frame supports planning for successful change initiatives through providing vision, communication and

networks. The *symbolic frame* puts culture, values, trust, emotions, ceremony and ritual at the heart of institutional life – it is not so much about what happens but what meaning is created from it by staff members. An appreciation for history and tradition is significant. Credibility and the sharing of meaning and beliefs are enablers. Inspiring staff members and creating a shared vision underpinned by words, attitude and actions will motivate and facilitate engagement and commitment to enable change. Creation of symbols (including awards) which have meaning is important. Absences and silences speak loudly (Lieff, 2010; Buller, 2015). Neglecting this frame causes barriers to change.

These four frames should ideally be combined to maximise the affordances of an enabling environment. Leaders who use such multi-frame thinking would be more successful and effective, but they often tend to use only one or two frames in their thinking (Kezar & Holcombe, 2016:43).

The focus will now turn to the discussion of the findings in an attempt to follow the movement of the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role from the periphery towards the centre of the institution. The discussion is structured according to three distinct phases, based on crucial instances of change within the T&L environment at the institution.

4 Findings and discussion

4.1 Phase 1: Establishment phase (1998–2003)

International, national and institutional imperatives, loosely summarised under the umbrella terms of 'renewal and transformation' (Botha, 1999) led to the establishment of the Division of University Education (Uni-Ed) at Stellenbosch University during 1998. These imperatives were experienced as enabling and a motivation to establish such an entity at the institution:

So, it counted in our favour that all these new national [teaching governance and accountability] things were going on at the time. (Drew)

The division reported directly to the Vice-Rector (Academic) who was responsible for both the Research, and the Teaching and Learning functions. Uni-Ed had a teaching innovation, lecturer development, as well as a quality assurance focus. The newly appointed Director of the Division was a senior academic and an innovative, enthusiastic teacher who believed in relationship building and buy-in. As a visionary leader, the Director established and led various task teams, formulated several strategic documents and policies about teaching, learning and professional learning (PL) of academics and proposed innovative structures and committees to drive and support the teaching function (Botha, 1999; Leibowitz & Adendorff, 2007). The conceptualisation of strategic documents with a view to the future often acted as pulling mechanisms for an envisaged change. This point was made by one interviewee when stating that "... [policy] has got power because you can mobilise" (Kris) and echoed by another, indicating that "...sometimes a new imaginative policy can make a big change" (Drew).

The first institutional *Strategy for Learning and Teaching 2002-2004* was formulated in response to the *Strategic Framework for the turn of the Century and thereafter* (2000). This strategy drew on the recommendations report from the *Task Group for Learning and Teaching* (TGLT) which

was in existence from 1999-2001 and which involved international experts from England, Scotland and the Netherlands. This Strategy proposed an overarching approach where “[t]he focus unequivocally falls on the students and on the quantity and quality of what they learn, and not primarily on either the lecturers or the methods that lecturers utilise for transmitting discipline-specific subject knowledge” (Stellenbosch University, 2002:3). It furthermore formulated a series of institutional action plans to realise the stated focus:

1. special and designated training in postgraduate study guidance for lecturers;
2. developing module and generic skills outcomes for all modules to be used as the basis to;
3. improve the quality and the methods of student assessment;
4. developing an assessment policy and embark on the continuous development, training and support of assessors;
5. a concerted effort to improve the learning culture;
6. a minimum electronic presence for all modules;
7. introducing programme committees and programme co-ordinators as of 2003;
8. establishing the *Fund for Innovation and Research in Learning and Teaching* (FIRLT) in 2003 to stimulate and support innovation in and research on T&L;
9. during 2002 the *Committee for Learning and Teaching* will embark on an initiative within the faculties to stimulate a discourse on ways and means to improve the standing of teaching including
 - 9.1 finding ways to adapt current appointment and promotion processes in order to make adequate provision for special achievements in teaching,
 - 9.2 introducing a system of presenting teaching portfolios as a basis on which to determine the quality of lecturers’ teaching,
 - 9.3 revising the current guidelines of the system of identifying candidates for the Rector’s Award for Excellence in T&L;
10. appropriate committee structures should be established on institutional and faculty levels;
11. all policy documents and regulations pertaining to T&L are to be revised and adapted to ensure that they will reflect and enhance the student-centred approach to T&L adopted by the institution. These include the following documents which are especially relevant in this regard:
 - 11.1 the guidelines for departmental self-evaluation and external evaluation;
 - 11.2 the forms used for the performance appraisal of academics; the criteria used to appoint and promote academics;
 - 11.3 the criteria used for *ad hominem* promotion of academics;
 - 11.4 the general questionnaire used for student feedback;
 - 11.5 the standards of obligatory course frameworks passed by Senate in 1995.

Structures are necessary to facilitate change and the action plans above aimed to establish such structures to enable the enhancement of the status of T&L. These action plans also speak to the political frame (e.g. reward and recognition), the human resource frame (e.g. assessor training) and the symbolic frame (e.g. the Rector’s Award for Excellence in T&L). In order to attain the stated action plans, resources, including human resources and funding, were needed as well as the support of senior management. Various interviewees referred to the importance of these structural, human resource and political prerequisites for change:

So, you need the support of the people, but without the funding – the same with FIRLT. If you don’t have funding for rewards, to run a conference, to invite speakers, to give people sabbaticals, you can’t change. So, these big structural things. You need policies, you need committees, you need money, you need people, you need the right attitude. It’s a combination of things. (Drew)

[SU has] ... a ... collegial system, the academics have much more power and ... one needs to work with the committees, certainly. So, ... [the] strategy was to work in the existing committees, establish new committees where ... there was a need and to strengthen those committees with really strong people. (Lee)

Intentionally inviting specific role players to serve on committees was mentioned by a number of the interviewees as strategically important to ensure the action plans would come to fruition and enhance the stature of T&L. These committee members were labelled as influential, powerful, representative, T&L champions – in short, 'the best':

What we succeeded in is getting the best people on the committees ... the vice deans teaching ... the really influential people. It means that they know what is going on in terms of the overall [T&L] thinking, but they also have the power to implement in their environment. (River)

The composition of those committees [was] to make sure that you get representation ... but also [T&L] champions. That was the developmental, intellectual stimulating thing. (Drew)

As indicated before, support from senior management is crucial for driving change, and one interviewee mentioned the following in this regard:

[The Vice Rector: Academic] created a stimulating environment and [I also had] ... some support ... from ... the Rector. (Drew)

Although professional learning of lecturers for their teaching role was only mentioned in terms of assessment in the action plans, Uni-Ed continued to fulfil its overarching brief for teaching innovation and lecturer development. An annual induction programme called the *Professional Educational Development of Newly Appointed Academics* (PREDAC) was newly conceptualised and implemented in 1999 (and is still running in a re-conceptualised way) and numerous T&L workshops on topics such as teaching large classes, use of multimedia and web applications and other topics aimed at enhancing teaching were presented to all lecturers. Due to the institutional culture and politics at the time, the traditional rift between academics and professional academic support staff who focused on T&L, was sometimes perceived as insurmountable and one interviewee reported being on the receiving end of the following comment from a fellow academic:

Remember if you take this [T&L] on, you will always be against the stream. (Drew)

Through all of this, Uni-Ed had to continue to "... find a niche ... there was a bit of institutional positioning to find a niche" (Drew) and Uni-Ed spearheaded the movement of T&L towards the centre of what is valued at the institution. Table 1.2 below summarises the enablers and constraints during this phase using Bolman and Deal's four frames. As can be seen from the table, the structural frame features quite strongly because the typical activities during the establishment of a new Centre focused on the professional learning of lecturers. The political frame also includes the visionary leadership and academic background of the director but is counter balanced by a limited number of T&L champions in this establishment phase. It is furthermore understandable that the enablers linked to the political and symbolic frames were still less prevalent, because many of the initiatives to establish the institutional positioning of Uni-Ed and bridging the gap between academic and professional academic support staff (PASS) through e.g. relationship building and research were still in infancy or totally absent.

Table 1.2 Summary of key findings in relation to the first phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining

Phase 1: Establishment phase (1998–2003)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Structural	Establishment of Uni-Ed. Director of Uni-Ed had direct reporting line to Vice-Rector (Academic). Establishment of Committee for Teaching and Learning. FIRLT conceptualised. Strategic documents formulated: Strategy for Learning and Teaching 2002-2004 including: ▶ E-campus strategy; ▶ Guidelines for departmental self-evaluation and external evaluation; reconceptualised and changed in line with QA requirements; ▶ Performance appraisal forms for academics; ▶ Criteria used to appoint and promote academics; ▶ Criteria used for ad hominem promotion of academics; ▶ General questionnaire used for student feedback. Standards of obligatory course frameworks passed by Senate.	Limited human resources and earmarked funding to execute the action plans in the strategic documents.
Human resources	Director of Uni-Ed was visionary leader. Director, coming from academia, established the principle of relationship building and obtaining buy-in. Intentionally inviting specific role players to serve on T&L related committees.	Limited number of T&L champions.

Table 1.2 Summary of key findings in relation to the first phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining (continued)

Phase 1: Establishment phase (1998–2003)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Political	Programme for newly appointed academics (PREDAC) (1999). Numerous T&L workshops on topics such as teaching large classes, use of multimedia and web applications and other T&L related topics for all lecturers. Vice-Rector(Academic), and since 2000 the Vice-Rector (T&L), created an enabling environment alongside support from Rector. Institutional positioning to find Uni-Ed's niche.	The PL offering was often rooted in good practice or theories from other fields, rather than the Scholarship of T&L. Traditional rift between academics and professional academic support staff was perceived as insurmountable. Not all senior managers (including those from executive, academic and professional support environments) were supportive of T&L.
Symbolic	Rector's Award for Excellence in T&L. Vice-Rector (T&L) position established alongside Vice-Rector (Research).	

4.2 Phase 2: Structurally stepping backwards, but resiliently pushing forward (2003–2013)

Uni-Ed was restructured in 2003 into the Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL) and the Quality Assurance Division. The newly appointed Director of the newly created Centre for Teaching and Learning had a reporting line within a new division called Student Academic Support Services (SAS). The Senior Director (SAS) in turn reported to the Vice-Rector (Teaching and Learning). One interviewee bemoaned the fact that this new reporting structure created a challenge, as the Centre for Teaching and Learning was the only centre out of five, within SAS, focusing on lecturers and teaching. Geographically the CTL was moved to the periphery of the campus, and the line management function was moved one level further down from the Vice-Rector (T&L). In the words of one of the interviewees, this broke a lot of momentum for T&L:

The other sense that I had ... around the restructuring, was the fact that ... teaching and learning ironically got shifted very far to the periphery, very far from the centre. So, [previously] there was Uni-Ed ... directly reporting to the DVC (T&L). Now all of a sudden you had the DVC (T&L), you had the [Senior Director (SAS)] ... as an intervening person. So, everything was suddenly three sets removed from the Centre and I also had the distinct sense that, that really broke a lot of momentum initially. (Pella)

In terms of Bolman and Deal's structural frame, this was therefore a step backwards which was further exacerbated by the perceived lack of support from some senior managers. Bitzer, in a 2006 journal article, (2006:379) bemoaned the fact that "[o]n the whole, teaching [at SU] was grossly neglected, causing academic staff and academic units further to doubt the value placed on teaching and in particular the scholarship of teaching." He further reported that, during this time, not all senior managers were supportive of T&L and this lack of support resulted in failure of some of the institutional T&L action plans.

An example of one such failure is the enactment of the institutional action plan to implement teaching portfolios to determine and reward good teaching. Alongside Bitzer (2006:379), Leibowitz and Adendorff (2007), as well as interviewees for this study reported on the failure of this initiative, after an announcement was made by the then Rector, indicating that all rated disciplinary researchers would receive a bonus. This announcement came a few days before the policy for the implementation of teaching portfolios was to serve at the Committee for Learning and Teaching. The decision was subsequently taken to withdraw the policy:

We had approval from all the faculties for the implementation of teaching portfolios for appointment and for promotion at the university. And the day ... or two before the committee, where it was finally going to be approved, [the Rector at the time] announced that all NRF rated scientists were going to get ... a ... bonus. And we actually pulled it. We pulled that policy because we realised there was no ways that it was ever going to get through. And so, I think there we had been on the cusp, because I think we understood that somehow you had to get people to articulate what they believed and how they lived those beliefs in their practice. And that the teaching portfolio was potentially a way to do that. And that was just snatched literally [from] under our noses. (Pella)

After this episode, Bitzer (2006:373) reported that academic staff voiced a concern that this event could signal the 'death of teaching excellence' and he questioned whether "it [would be] possible for the lost status of teaching ... to be restored or improved?" It is clear that this specific incident viewed through the lens of Bolman and Deal's political frame, presented a serious constraint for the promotion of learning and teaching.

As indicated before, the university was audited in 2005 and findings and suggestions from the CHE/HEQC audit report included the lack of availability of substantial formal PL opportunities for teaching (HEQC, 2007). Participation in these opportunities was however found to be voluntary and without incentive. Another CHE/HEQC finding was that PL for the improvement of teaching skills was not considered as a criterion for promotion (HEQC, 2007).

These events are examples of an environment where the structural enablers established in the first phase (institutional action plans) without the requisite human resource, political or symbolic enablers during the second phase were not enough to facilitate change. Interviewees in this study emphasised the importance of support from management, as part of the political frame, to drive change:

And you know it's the signals from management that makes the difference so it's very wrong ... not to see it as an opportunity for improvement [and only] as ... compliance. (Lee)

I remember people pitching into our workshops and [asking if] management supported this ... is it valued? That was always the word ... is this valued? If we put time and effort into this, is this valued? Yes, it is. We're getting money, there's recognition, it's an institutional initiative ... Let's go. So that [support and value] really created some fertile ground for us. (Jesse)

Furthermore, three different Vice Rectors (T&L) held office from 2003-2013 leading to changes in the strategic T&L foci which, on a structural and political level, created an unstable environment within the T&L fraternity. National and international changes during this time period also influenced what happened at the institution in terms of T&L:

...during that time [from 2007], ... there were a number of things that happened not only in the institution, but more broadly, internationally, nationally that started changing the climate around T&L ... at national level, the role that the CHE played with the institutional audits but also with the programme reviews and the publications from the CHE on T&L and then later on the Excellence Awards for T&L ... that certainly played a role to strengthen the stature of T&L at the institution. (Lee)

Up to this time, the student body at SU was mostly a homogenous and top achieving group. During this phase however, the continuous rapid growth in student numbers and diversification of the student body at the institution had a major impact on T&L in the classroom as well as on the professional learning needs of academics for their teaching. One interviewee summarised the situation as follows:

... for the first time, academics were confronted with students who did not come from excellent schools, who had not performed excellently academically at school, who were underprepared for HE to put it bluntly. And I think they [the lecturers] did not know how to handle this because the success rates, throughput rates, graduation rates all of those things have always been important for [SU] and people felt strongly that shouldn't slip, but also, they should not lower standards. So, I think that started putting pressure on academics to start thinking about their teaching differently and realizing that they might not have all the answers. (Lee)

The changes in the student body initiated change in the T&L arena and were also accompanied by higher accountability which interviewees described as a 'good thing'. The following quotes are illustrative of the comments made by interviewees:

And it's a combination of the fact that you have to be accountable to all the audiences, the lecturers, the students, the parents, the government ... it has its pros and cons, but it does have good effects. (Drew)

... very often, as the diversification of our student body contributed to a shift, you sometimes see other external triggers. (Lee)

An institutional attempt to improve the academic success of the student body, was the establishment of the First-Year Academy (FYA). This new structure focused on T&L for student success, was well funded and was positioned within the Centre for Teaching and Learning. As part of the FYA, faculty-specific T&L committees were formed where first-year success and support were discussed. A student-nominated award was instituted recognising those lecturers who made an impact on the success of first-year students. One interviewee reminisced on the value of this structural and well-resourced initiative with symbolic and political value as follows:

And there was money ... to do things. I realize how incredibly fortunate we were ... to do things ... to create opportunities ... we need to recognize the institution for that. Whether it was as a result of their vision or whether it was serendipity, I don't know. (Sam)

A new performance appraisal system was accepted and with it, the annual Rector's awards for Excellence in Teaching, Research, Community Interaction and Service were cancelled at the end of 2009. During the period of 2003 to 2013, numerous T&L committees, policy development task teams and strategic T&L initiatives were established at the institution with a view to lifting the stature of teaching to the same level as that of research. As became evident in the first phase (1998-2002), T&L committees and task teams created spaces for T&L to flourish and these were also used as PL spaces. Interviewees commented about the affordances of these spaces as follows:

Everybody who was part of that [policy development task team] reached a new level of [T&L] understanding. (Kris)

I think the other contributing factor giving teaching and learning more prominence was the annual report to Senate of teaching and learning matters. (Lee)

During this second phase, the CTL continued to build on the work of its predecessor, Uni-Ed, and presented workshops and other PL opportunities for lecturers. Some of these opportunities became more faculty and/or departmentally focused to cater for the specific needs of different entities and disciplines. Funding became available for T&L, and the institutional Fund for Innovation and Research in Learning and Teaching (already proposed in 1999), awarding small amounts of money for T&L related innovations and research, came into fruition and was accompanied by bi-annual writing retreats; the first annual, institutional Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) conference was organised; an institutional Teaching Fellowship programme kicked off; Vice-Deans (T&L) were appointed in some faculties and monthly lunch hour Auxin¹ sessions became part of the formal PL offering for teaching. The SoTL conference especially created a platform for sharing both good practice and T&L research conducted at SU. These initiatives broadened the conversations about T&L at SU and supported the vision of one interviewee, namely to "... [get] the institution as a whole ... to understand that teaching and learning is everybody's responsibility ... and that we actually have a lot of partners on campus that can all contribute to teaching and learning." (Lee). In support of the 'whole institution' vision, this interviewee shared the deliberate actions taken to close the gap between the different role-players in the T&L arena:

... during my [time in a management position] I felt it to be very important to try and close the gap between the so-called support services and the faculties because I think in that time there was a very clear gap, a clear distinction ... where deans or other faculty representatives were simply not very interested in what's happening in support services. (Lee)

During this period some CTL staff members collaborated on national T&L research projects and started PhD studies in the fields of Academic Development and Higher Education. This contributed to addressing the divide between the academic and PASS environments thereby addressing issues within the political frame. Although this phase was fraught with troublesome challenges, at the end of it, teaching and learning was in a strong position as pointed out by one interviewee:

... in 2012 ... Teaching and Learning at Stellenbosch University has been in a strong position for [some] years. (River)

1 Auxin means growth in Greek. Auxin sessions are presented once a month over the lunch hour and provide scholarly 'padkos' (food for the road) for the teaching journey as well as 'padkos' for the tummy.

Table 1.3 presents a summary of the enablers and constraints during this phase using Bolman and Deal's framework. It is evident from the table that CTL staff members resolutely pushed forward to broaden their own sphere of influence through research and studies (human resource frame) and thus strengthened the political frame through the continuous relationship building and making funding available to lecturers who wanted to focus on their T&L. The symbolic frame was also boosted through the first annual Scholarship for Teaching and Learning conference albeit with limited attendance at first. Structurally this phase was a step backwards, but the founding of the First-Year Academy with its faculty-based Learning and Teaching Committees did lay the groundwork for enabling spaces within faculties for discussions about learning and teaching.

Table 1.3 Summary of key findings in relation to the second phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining

Phase 2: Structurally stepping backwards, but resiliently pushing forward (2003–2013)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Structural	Founding of the First-Year Academy and faculty-based Learning and Teaching Committees to discuss first-year success.	Director of CTL had reporting line within SAS; the other four centres had a student focus. CTL was now one level removed from the VR(T&L). Three different Vice-Rectors (T&L) from 2002 to 2013. Moving the CTL offices physically to the periphery of the campus.
Human Resource	More T&L research undertaken. Profile of CTL staff members raised through collaboration on national research projects PhD studies of CTL staff members in Academic Development and Higher Education.	

Table 1.3 Summary of key findings in relation to the second phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining (continued)

Phase 2: Structurally stepping backwards, but resiliently pushing forward (2003–2013)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Political	Continuation of building of relationships with lecturers and key stakeholders to obtain buy-in Faculty- and departmentally-focused workshops instead of general/generic workshops. Fund for Innovation and Research in Learning and Teaching funded. Institutional Teaching Fellowship programme. Signs of decrease in the divide between academic and professional support staff. Higher student numbers and more accountability for student success.	Announcement of the Rector that all NRF-rated disciplinary researchers would receive a bonus.
Symbolic	Task teams to enhance the stature of teaching and learning. Inaugural conference Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.	Limited number of participants in Scholarship of Teaching.

4.3 Phase 3: Intentionally embedding scholarly teaching within faculties and creating a trajectory of professional learning for teaching (2013–2018)

At the beginning of 2013, the Division for Learning and Teaching Enhancement (DLTE) was established as an umbrella division headed up by a Senior Director reporting to the Vice-Rector (Learning and Teaching). The CTL was once again restructured and their staff complement became much smaller, as the staff focusing on the support and integration of learning technologies into T&L were moved to a new centre, the Centre for Learning Technologies. The Language Centre was also included under the Division. Towards the end of 2017, the Centre for Academic Planning and Quality Assurance became another sister centre in the Division, with a focus on quality assurance and enhancement as well as academic programme planning, approval, review and renewal.

The creation of a Division with a direct reporting line to the Vice-Rector (Learning and Teaching), with the words 'teaching and learning' in its name was welcomed by interviewees as it seemed to signal the structural importance and symbolic value of T&L:

The other thing the restructuring did was to [create] a Division which I think was good in the sense ... there was a Division now which had a name, Teaching and Learning, which [was not there] before [when T&L were] under this amorphous Student Affairs Division. (Kris)

I definitely do think it's got symbolic value in terms of the name itself being connected ... it also brings together many aspects related to T&L which are quite crucial ... the name signifies the prominence of T&L and it definitely did help to give it more prominence, absolutely. (Jesse)

The second quote above also emphasises the structural importance of the Division in terms of bringing together all aspects related to teaching and learning. The splitting of the existing CTL into two separate centres, a much smaller CTL and the Centre for Learning Technologies, both with a focus on teaching and the PL of academics (albeit smaller on the technology side due to their other institutional responsibilities and foci in the field of technology), was however somewhat puzzling to one interviewee:

I found [the restructuring of CTL] very strange ... the de-linking of the E-learning from the CTL because nationally things were going the other way. The literature [was] also speaking towards embedding E-learning into teaching and learning. (Kris)

During this time, the PL opportunities for teaching became more embedded within the faculties and often in collaboration with lecturers. This took place within a devolved model where CTL advisors were assigned a percentage of their time to a specific faculty with a shared line management function to the Vice-deans (T&L) in the respective faculties, while still having responsibilities towards central T&L projects. One interviewee commented that the devolved way of working was a success story whereas another interviewee highlighted the complexities of the devolved model:

What I think worked well ... is that the services that we offer ... professional academic service [to] the university, had been devolved into the faculty. (River)

... [working in a devolved way is] one of the most difficult models to make work and I remember testing [it] at an international university ... in Canada ... and talking about this model ... the people always say it's really, really difficult [but, at SU] it was kind of announced ... that's the way we're going to work and now let's make it work. So, I think without really always thinking through all the complexities of doing it. So, I must say if we talk internationally, if we share this example, international people are always saying, Wow, really, is it really working? (Jesse)

Not all faculties could however be assigned an advisor due to the fact that the CTL did not have an adequate number of advisers. This brings a question around the care for the academic development function and the academic development staff at the institution which links to the human resource frame (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Although the devolved model contributes to the movement of the T&L function towards the centre of the institutional activities and priorities, an interviewee questioned this model in terms of unrealistic expectations which often created an unbearable workload for academic development staff members:

...the workload changed ... and suddenly [academic development staff] had to take on faculty specific duties and ... central projects remained the same ... there was a huge increase in workload with a huge reduction in staff. (Kris)

Interviewees also commented on traumatic times for academic development staff during and after various restructuring episodes:

[CTL staff] were really worried about retrenchment [which] ... created lots of instability, low staff morale and lots of uncertainty ... [and] time needed to be spent on developing [CTL] advisers into those kinds of generalist academic developers who felt confident to go into a faculty. (Kris)

I think it was quite a traumatic time for many people ... we had to take some time for consolidation and focus ... (Jesse)

In an attempt to counter the disruption and equip CTL staff to fulfil their duties, some individuals completed PhD studies in HE and under the leadership of a new Director, the CTL staff took a more scholarly approach towards their activities and created their own PL space. As up to this stage "... [at SU] academic development of lecturers for their teaching was very much seen as a support service model and not sort of a scholarly academic role that you had to play at the university" (Kris).

Another question that remains to be asked is one about the value of lecturers as human beings and the value of their PL for their teaching. This question links to comments made by two interviewees. The first comment was about the dangers of a neoliberalist and accompanying managerialist approach:

My personal opinion is that the neoliberalist agenda leading to increased managerialism in our institutions is the biggest, biggest risk for teaching and learning in future. (Lee)

The second comment is related to the first and the interviewee spoke about the instrumentalisation of lecturers and asked if and how lecturers as individual human beings and their personal development are valued:

... my sense was that it was getting lost was the valuing of the lecturer as a person in their own right ... there was a huge instrumentalisation of the lecturer. You are simply there as a tool to make sure the students get through, that the student succeeds and your own growth and development value as an important part of this thing that is the university wasn't – that was something that I always sensed was very strong in the professional learning team which I had a sense was very different ... management had this very instrumental view was my perspective of lecturers as, 'this is what you must do so that that can happen'. Not you are valued as an individual in your own right. This was a very strong sense I had. (Pella)

Despite these challenges, other structural arrangements were put in place to enhance the status of teaching. The senior directors of the Divisions for Learning and Teaching Enhancement (DLTE) and Research Development (DRD) became jointly responsible for the management of the University Capacity Development Programme and Grant.² This also led to the joint Early Career Academics' Development project which attempts to bring the research and teaching

2 The University Capacity Development Programme and Grant (UCDP/G) is funding made available by the Department of Higher Education and Training (DHET). These funds are intended to contribute towards the implementation of a comprehensive programme that is DHET's primary vehicle to drive transformation in the sector. The UCDP will enable an integrated and holistic approach to student-, staff-, programme- and curriculum development in the university sector, partly supported by the UCDG, but supported by other DHET and institutional resources as well. It is essential that resources across the system are drawn on in a coordinated fashion to address the transformation challenges that confront the system. Available at <https://bit.ly/3eWLLZQ>

functions closer to each other, as mentees could indicate whether they would prefer a mentor that could provide mentorship in terms of disciplinary research and ways of being, or focusing on the teaching function and scholarship.

During this phase, the emphasis also shifted to include the creation of professional learning opportunities for T&L leadership at the institution. A group of nine staff members including the Vice-Rector (Learning and Teaching), senior managers and vice-deans (Learning and Teaching), completed a short course on the Scholarship of Educational Leadership from the University of British Columbia (UBC). This experience created a T&L community of practice among these individuals:

...the UBC Scholarship of Educational leadership short course ... created a very strong community of practice ... it started creating a common vocabulary that we could speak to with the vice deans Teaching and Learning. (Jesse)

Upon completion of the course, this community of practice was sustained by the formalisation of a T&L Forum consisting of the Vice-Deans (T&L), the DLTE Senior Director, LTE centre directors and chaired by the Vice-Rector (Learning and Teaching). This T&L Forum meets four times a year and serves as a T&L think-tank. It has provided a much-needed platform for Vice-Deans (T&L) to share and learn more about various aspects of T&L and specifically programme renewal.

The UBC short course experience also led to the conceptualisation of an SU-specific Scholarship of Educational Leadership (SoEL) Short Course which was presented for the first cohort of 11 academics during 2018.

During this period of 2013-2018 a number of initiatives that contributed to the political and symbolic value of learning and teaching saw the light: SU Council accepted a proposal for the promotion and recognition of academics for their teaching; the institutional Teaching Excellence Awards were reinstated and aligned with the annual Research Awards; an Information and Communications Technology (ICT) in Learning and Teaching project was funded by the institutional Council; and academic programme renewal became one of the strategic foci of the Vice-Rector (L&T). With the approval of the ICT project, money was made available for T&L renewal and innovation. The value of resources for driving change was mentioned before and one interviewee commented as follows about its value in the new dispensation:

...the ICT teaching and learning [project, funded by the University] Council provided much needed institutional funding ... creating the whole environment for ICT teaching and learning to flourish. (Jesse)

This availability of resources enabled the appointment of a blended learning coordinator (BLC) for additional T&L human resource capacity in most faculties. It was envisaged that the CTL advisor, the BLC, Vice-dean (T&L) (where applicable) and other T&L role players within each of the faculties, would establish T&L hubs as collaborative spaces to enhance T&L within faculties building on the spaces created during the first phase through the First-Year Academy. This initiative had mixed success in the different faculties.

Another incident that changed the T&L landscape and placed the focus on the renewal of T&L programmes was the Fees Must Fall (#FMF) student protests which disrupted most campuses in the country from 2015 to 2017. Student calls for the decolonisation of the curriculum stressed the importance of interrogating and renewing of curricula:

... the big thing today would be the whole Fees must Fall (#FMF) analogy and to what extent that makes people more or less receptive to any given initiative. (Pella)

Academic programme renewal as key strategic priority of the Vice-Rector (Learning and Teaching) encompassing many dimensions based on the academic programme's unique context, also received institutional UCDG funding. This funding was distributed to faculties based on faculty-specific project renewal plans and could be utilised for buying-out the time of academics to spend time on T&L related aspects, administrative support and presenting of workshops. The availability of funding for T&L activities, has previously been described by one of the Vice-Deans (L&T) as a 'game changer' in terms of their faculty's programme renewal initiatives.

A new, progressive Teaching and Learning Policy was accepted by the university Council at the end of 2018 (SU T&L Policy, 2018). This policy advocates a focus on learning-centred teaching as well as a focus on the PL of academics for their teaching. This is a huge step forward from the previous policy that stated "... an overarching approach where "[t]he focus unequivocally falls on the students and on the quantity and quality of what they learn, and not primarily on either the lecturers or the methods that lecturers utilise for transmitting discipline-specific subject knowledge" (Strategy for Learning and Teaching 2002-2004:3). It also succeeds in being more intentional and explicit about the expectations and accompanying enablers for T&L at the institution. This was elaborated on by an interviewee as follows:

But I think we are becoming more explicit now especially in the teaching and learning policy ... more intentional in terms of say, taking [lecturers] from a reflective practitioner to a leaderly teaching scholar. (Jesse)

All these institutional initiatives are pointing towards a shift taking place within the institution with regards to the stature of T&L and as can be seen in Table 1.4 below, this phase is characterised by especially structural, political and symbolic enablers with the devolved model as both a human resource enabler by embedding academic development activities in faculties but also a constraint in terms of the care for academic development personnel.

Table 1.4 Summary of key findings in relation to the third phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining

Phase 3: Intentionally embedding scholarly teaching within faculties and creating a continuous trajectory of professional learning (2013–2018)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Structural	New Division for Teaching and Learning Enhancement containing CTL, CLT, LC and APQ. Formation of T&L hubs (BLC, CTL advisor, Vice-dean (T&L) and other faculty members) in faculties. New Language Policy (2016). New Teaching and Learning Policy (2018).	Questions about the split of T&L and Technology in two separate centres. Restructuring was a traumatic experience with fear of retrenchment. T&L hubs not established in all faculties.

Table 1.4 Summary of key findings in relation to the third phase, categorised according to Bolman and Deal's framework and identified as enabling or constraining (continued)

Phase 3: Intentionally embedding scholarly teaching within faculties and creating a continuous trajectory of professional learning (2013–2018)		
	Enablers	Constraints
Human Resource	Devolved model with academic development activities embedded in faculties. Appointment of blended learning coordinators (BLC) in faculties.	Questions about care for academic development personnel who had to assume new roles within faculties. Lack of academic development capacity to fulfil all needs within all faculties.
Political	Academic support shifted from support role to a more scholarly academic support role through an enhanced focus on research. Proposal for the promotion and recognition of academics for their teaching accepted by University Council. ICT in Learning and Teaching project funded by University Council. Programme renewal became one of the strategic foci of the Vice-Rector (L&T). UCDG funding for the development of early career academics. Vice-Deans T&L Forum established. Short Course on the Scholarship of Educational Leadership.	Neoliberalist agenda leading to increased managerialism as biggest potential risk for the T&L function. Instrumentalisation of those who teach.
Symbolic	Gap narrowing between academic and PASS staff. because of collaborative research projects Division with the name "Teaching and Learning Enhancement" which integrated all academic support services to do with T&L. Teaching Excellence Awards reinstated and aligned with the annual Research Awards.	

5 Conclusion

Researching the change in the status of teaching and learning at the University of Stellenbosch interrogates aspects of leadership and change within the structural, political, human resources and symbolic spheres, and is therefore both complex and urgent. As mentioned earlier, change is understood to be pervasive, thus affecting numerous offices, units and individuals across the institution; deep, thus touching upon values, beliefs, structures, and resources, including human resources; intentional; and occurring over time. Change within HEIs should be led differently from change in other organisations, due to the unique, more collegial nature of HEIs (Buller, 2015).

It is clear from the interview data as well as the institutional documentation viewed through the four lenses of the Bolman and Deal framework that change in the status of T&L at SU has been a slow, organic and phased process with each new phase drawing from and building on the previous. This aligns with the contention that “[c]hange is not an event, with a beginning, middle and comfortable end point. Rather it is an ongoing, organic process in which one change triggers another, often in unexpected places, and through which an interrelationship of the component parts leads to an unending cycle of reassessment and renewal” (Eckel, Hill, Green & Mallon, 1998:2).

The focus of this research was on identifying the institutional enablers that brought about change and made possible the move of the T&L function and the PL of academics for their teaching role from the periphery towards the centre of what is valued and supported at SU. The constraining factors along this journey can however not be negated and call for attention as they are potential keys to ‘keeping the wind in the T&L sails’. The table summaries of the enablers and constraints in each of the three phases indicate that in terms of the:

- ▶ Structural lens, all three phases had both enablers and constraints, but that significant progress has been made in terms of establishing committees and policies with direct bearing on T&L as well as the subsequent re-positioning of the T&L function with a reporting line directly to the VR (L&T);
- ▶ Human Resource lens, progress has been made through the devolved model of T&L support, but there remains concern on the cultural level, also in terms of the care provided for both the academics as individuals and academic development practitioners;
- ▶ Political lens, the relationships between PASS and faculties became stronger and the various fora and institutional projects created to engage in learning and teaching enhancement activities played an important role in moving T&L towards the centre;
- ▶ Symbolic lens, visionary leadership and top management support were crucial in the movement of T&L towards the centre during each phase.

From the findings above it becomes clear that there has been movement in the stature of T&L from the periphery towards the centre. Over the twenty years, leading up to the centenary year of the institution, SU has certainly made strides towards valuing and rewarding T&L. The findings indicate that during all three phases a significant number of structural initiatives and support contributed to the shift. Such structural initiatives and support are however often easy to make “... by the stroke of a pen”, but it takes a far greater investment of time and energy to bring about

cultural changes (Buller, 2015:173). On the other hand, what emerged from this study, is that the institutional policies and strategies did contribute to changes in the institutional culture related to T&L and to ascribing it greater value and stature.

Reflecting on the three phases also showed that shifting the beliefs and values and ultimately the culture in terms of T&L at the institution was and is a much slower and more fragmented process than shifting structures. Shifts in culture cannot happen without strong institutional leadership as change agents and creators of enabling spaces for enhancing the status of T&L and moving it towards the centre of what is valued at HEIs. This, together with the tireless labour by those in the T&L trenches, working in partnership with academics are non-negotiable and of utmost importance in this process of change. We are witnesses of the slow but certain move of T&L from the periphery to the centre of what is valued at SU by building on the successes of the past and intentionally planning for the future.

6 Acknowledgements

Unfortunately, two key role players in the T&L arena at SU over the years, passed away before this research was done. Although their voices are not included here, their legacies are interwoven with T&L at the institution and we thus acknowledge the work of Professors Russel Botman and Brenda Leibowitz.

References

- Bitzer, E. (2006). Restoring the status of teaching scholarship at a research orientated university. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 20(4):372-390. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v20i4.25672>
- Bolman, L. & Deal, T. (2008). *Reframing Organizations*. 4th ed. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Botha, J. (1999). *Gespreksdokument: Op pad na 'n aangepaste onderrigbenadering aan die Universiteit van Stellenbosch*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch Universiteit.
- Botha, J. (2018). Academic Work at Stellenbosch University during its first hundred years as independent university, 1918-2018. In: A. Grundlingh (ed.), *Stellenbosch University 1918-2018*. Stellenbosch University: Stellenbosch. pp. 199-233.
- Buller, J.L. (2015). *Change leadership in higher education: A practical guide to academic transformation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119210825>
- Cilliers, F.J. & Herman, N. (2010). Impact of an educational development programme on teaching practice of academics at a research-intensive university. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 15(3):253-267. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2010.497698>
- Dunkin, R. (2001). Teaching and learning in universities. *HERDSA News*, 23(2):1-4.
- Eckel, P., Hill, B. & Green, M. (1998). *On change: En route to transformation*. Washington DC: American Council on Education.
- Gill, R. (2002). Change Management or Change Leadership? *Journal of Change Management*, 3(4):307-318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714023845>
- HEQC. (2007). Audit report on Stellenbosch University (Unpublished report). Pretoria. Available: <http://www.che.ac.za>.
- Herman, N. (2015). *The role of context in decision making about professional learning by lecturers at a research-intensive university*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Hutchings, P. (2000). *Approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning*. Menlo Park, CA: Carnegie.
- Hutchings, P., Huber, M.T. & Golde, C.M. (2006). *Integrating work and life: A vision for a changing academy*. <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/perspectives/integrating-work-and-life>.
- Johnston, S. (1998). Women and professional development in higher education: A search for understanding. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 3(1):64-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144980030109>
- Kezar, A. & Holcombe, E. (2016). Institutional Transformation in STEM: Insights from Change Research and the Keck-PKAL Project. In: G.C. Weaver, W.D. Burgess, A.L. Childress & L. Slakey (eds.), *Transforming Institutions: Undergraduate STEM Education for the 21st Century*. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press. pp. 1-528. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2002.0038>
- Kezar, A.J. & Eckel, P.D. (2002). The Effect of Institutional Culture on Change Strategies in Higher Education: Universal Principles or Culturally Responsive Concepts? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(4):435-460.
- Leibowitz, B. (2014). Conducive environments for the promotion of quality teaching in higher education in South Africa. *Critical Studies in Teaching and Learning*, 2(1):49-73.
- Leibowitz, B. & Adendorff, H. (2007). Teaching and learning strategies as mechanisms to advance change at university level: A case study. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 21(1):112-128. <https://doi.org/10.4314/sajhe.v21i1.25605>
- Lieff, S.J. (2010). Faculty development: Yesterday, today and tomorrow: Guide supplement 33. 2 – Viewpoint 1. *Medical teacher AMEE Guide Supplements*, 32:429-431. <https://doi.org/10.3109/01421591003677905>
- McKinney, K. (2006). Attitudinal and structural factors contributing to challenges in the work of the scholarship of teaching and learning. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 129:37-50. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.170>
- Mullings, B. (1999). Insider or outsider, both or neither: Some dilemmas of interviewing a cross-cultural setting. *Geoforum*, 30:337-350. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185\(99\)00025-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0016-7185(99)00025-1)
- Murray, K. & Macdonald, R. (1997). The disjunction between lecturers' conceptions of teaching and their claimed educational practice. *Higher Education*, 33(3):331-349. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1002931104852>

- Rowland, S. & Barton, L. (1994). 26/03/2014. Making things difficult: Developing a research approach to teaching in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 19(3):367-374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079412331381940>
- Stellenbosch University. (2000). *Institutional Strategic Framework*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Stellenbosch University. (2002). *Stellenbosch University Learning and Teaching Strategy 2002-2004*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University.
- Van Schalkwyk, S., Leibowitz, B., Herman, N. & Farmer, J. (2015). Reflections on professional learning: Choices, context and culture. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, 46(September):4-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2015.03.002>
- Viskovic, A.R. (2009). Survey of literature relating to tertiary teacher development and qualifications. Unpublished PhD thesis. New Zealand: Whitireia Community Polytechnic.