

The games we play: A situated approach to engaging disciplinary academic teams for the internationalisation of their curriculum.



Rules of Engagement

- ✓ Develop within disciplinary teams
- ✓ Scope the territory using QIC²
- ✓ Provide good facilitation
- ✓ Develop distributed leadership
- ✓ Make space for the imagination
- ✓ Link to external expertise & resources
- ✓ Take a 'whole of program' approach
- ✓ Providing a catalyst & goals/deadlines
- ✓ Recognise & reward good practice
- ✓ Create cross-disciplinary conversations
- ✓ Foster a scholarly approach (action research)

1. Go - a game with black and white pellets defined situationally where movement is relatively free. Pellets operate in an open, non-striated space where power is fluid rather than hierarchically fixed. Chess - a game of closed, regulated spaces and territories; pieces are coded with pre-determined and hierarchically organised roles/functions.

2. QIC— Questionnaires for initiating discussion between disciplinary team members about curriculum internationalisation

Abstract

The games we play: A situated approach to engaging disciplinary academic teams for the internationalisation of their curriculum

Authors: Craig Whitsed, Wendy Green and Rhonda Breit.

In the era of the global multiversity (Collini, 2013) university education is an evolving game with new rules requiring new strategies. Rapid technological change and the international commodification of education mean that the geographical, spatial and temporal boundaries of the University must be continually renegotiated. While many universities have embraced internationalisation at the policy level, gaps between rhetoric and practice are commonly observed at the faculty level (Childres, 2009). Indeed, 'internationalisation of the curriculum' (IoC) (Leask 2009) is unlikely to occur unless academics are engaged, as disciplinary communities, in the conception, implementation and evaluation of the processes of teaching and learning (Clifford, 2009; Green & Whitsed 2013; Leask 2013).

New strategies are needed to support academics' professional development for IoC. Freedman (2013, p. 21) suggests strategy can be defined as 'being about a balance between ends, ways, and means; and about the resources and methods available for meeting such objectives'. Thus understood, strategy is fluid and flexible, governed by the starting point rather than the end game.

This paper addresses the conference theme, strategic educational development by discussing a strategy to cultural and institutional change for IoC which was implemented in two Australian universities. Drawing on Deleuze and Guattari's notions of space, we conceptualise IoC as a situated, participatory process of opening spaces in a process of deterritorialization. In *A Thousand Plateaus* (1980), they liken the hierarchical imposition of change to the strategic games Chess and Go. In each game it is the intrinsic qualities of the pieces that regulates the organization of space and determines the possibilities for play. Chess is a game of closed space and territorialisation; each piece is coded with pre-determined and hierarchically organised roles/functions. In contrast, Go pellets are defined situationally and movement is relatively free; pieces operate in an open, non-striated space where power is fluid rather than hierarchically fixed. During the course of the game, the 'identity' of the disk changes depending on its relationship to other discs. Thus, the disc/individual is always in process, a perpetual state of becoming.

Deleuze and Guattari's illustration informed our strategic approach in our action research project, 'Extending Internationalisation of the Curriculum (IoC) in Action'. The project enabled us to reassess and extend the Leask (2012) *IoC in Action Framework*. Following Leask (2012), our central research question continued to be: How can we internationalise the curriculum in particular discipline areas, in particular institutional contexts, and ensure that, as a result, we improve the learning outcomes of all students?

We defined our approach as critical participatory action research in that it was cyclical, participatory, reflective and on-going (Kemmis 2007). The strategy involved working with disciplinary teams within their own contexts rather adopting more centralized, generic approaches to professional

development. Across the two universities, a diverse range of disciplinary teams have participated and continue to participate with the project. Evidence has been collected throughout the project in the form of surveys, interviews, observations and reflections. In this paper we discuss two case studies (drawn from nursing and journalism), to exemplify the impact of this strategy. Comparing the two reveals insights into the operationalisation of IoC across different disciplinary and university settings. Common factors emerged as essential ingredients to IoC success, yet the process in each discipline was very different. The project enabled each disciplinary team to address the question 'what does IoC look like in my discipline in my university', in ways that reflected their disciplinary ways of knowing, teaching, learning, and assessing. At the same time, periodic meetings between disciplinary teams involved in the project opened up 'critical interdisciplinary spaces' (Rowland 2006) for sharing, critique, and further action.

This project highlights the possibilities for imagining and doing when the strategic 'games' disciplinary academics and developers play are more akin to Go than Chess. As project leaders, disciplinary academics and educational (academic) developers, we critically reflect on our various roles in the IoC process, particularly in relation to issues of identity and power. We conclude with recommendations on how universities might better support IoC at a disciplinary level.

Audience engagement will be encouraged, with opening and closing questions used to stimulate discussion.