

EDITORIAL Volume 8 No. 1

Breaking the pattern: Creative voices

This issue of the *Journal of Learning Design* presents six highly original perspectives on teaching and learning in higher education. Edward de Bono (1992) argued that "there is no doubt that creativity is the most important human resource of all. *Without creativity, there would be no progress, and we would be forever repeating the same patterns*" (p. 169, emphases added).

If there were but one way to teach – one set of commonly-agreed pedagogical patterns - there would be no need for the *Journal of Learning Design*. Designing learning experiences is always bespoke – there are no formulas or predetermined ways of teaching. If this were the case, the authors in this and our other issues would not creatively wrestle with or seek to problematise how to improve their teaching practice or how to better engage and challenge their students. They would not aim to confirm or refute their observations through theoretical frameworks or empirical studies. They would not do anything but stand before students and talk "at" them; they would not share with them the structures underpinning their learning; and they would not allow them to learn by doing. The authors in this issue have done these things and, in these pages, graciously share their experiences and their personal perspectives with you.

This issue

The first paper in this issue, by **Adam**, from James Cook University, Australia, presents a radical and highly creative but well-founded approach to the (re)solving of wicked problems, called Birelational Design (BD). The article is theoretical and manages to successfully blend ideas from Hegel, Bakhtin, Kolb and Dr Seuss. It is also practical in that it provides an illustration, namely, an interactive rubric for academic literacy, which makes applied use of BD. The complexity of Bi-relational Design is made accessible through the author's systematic explanation and presentation through its principles as well as its six recurrent phases. It is hoped that readers can identify the pre-positional, para-positional, equipositional, oppositional and appositional ways of knowing within their own disciplines.

Our second paper, by **Tom**, from Central Queensland University (Australia) presents an original framework for teaching, the *Five C Framework* with each of the Cs - Consistency, Collaboration, Cognition, Conception, and Creativity- describing the critical aspects needed for the effective teaching of diverse cohorts of students. While Tom's observations come from a particular setting, that is, the teaching of computer programming at postgraduate level to students from a wide variety of disciplines, her findings and framework will have wider application. The Five C Framework outlines teaching practice designed to replace the traditional lecture with "packs"

or sessions, namely, Explanation or Elaboration; Conceive and Communicate; Interaction; and Collaborative Problem Solving. A formal study showed that use of the Five C Framework had multiple positive outcomes, such as the removal of negative emotional issues and stress impacting on study and the promotion of active learning and increased engagement.

In the third paper in this issue, **Casey** and **Wells**, from Deakin University, share the original concept of *remixing* and applying it to learning design. The authors have extrapolated their findings from an empirical study based in a secondary school into a higher education setting. This paper is an important reminder that our teaching and learning design is not a closed or insular process. Effective practices can be "remixed" into other contexts and, in the instance of this paper, this involves the use of social media. While "remixing" is perhaps something that all educators do in unconscious ways, these authors have reflected on their practice and made their remixing explicit. As with the other authors in this issue, they have taken a critical and analytic look at their practice.

pp. 38-54 – needs to be converted to pdf (but not on Mac)

The fourth paper in this issue, **Cox**, **Simpson**, **Letts** and **Cavanagh** "re-think" a critical aspect of nursing and allied health professional education, that is, of infection prevention and control. The authors have here looked beyond a competency to the key areas of influence: perceptions of science, health behaviour beliefs (perceived risk and self-efficacy) and applied knowledge (microbiology). They have identified the need for the integration of these aspects into the curriculum. Their simple continuum of educational states (knows, knows how, shows and does) belies a complexity of student knowledge which goes well beyond the notion of competence.

The fifth paper in this issue, by **Cydis**, Richard Stockton College (USA), is connected to the previous paper (Cox et al., this issue) through its reference to graduate competencies and how, in each instance, the author has sought creative and effective ways of moving a competency into authentic professional practice. Cydis has, in her paper, shared how students in a teacher education program have come to understand how technology can enhance learning by applying it to their own learning. Her paper is based on her observations of her students and supported by data collected through a survey. Her paper critically shows how positive learning environments give students both competence and confidence to use technology in authentic ways in their own teaching.

The sixth and final paper paper, by **Willems**, the Manager of the *Redelivery* Initiative, the Queensland University of Technology, presents an original and highly personalised essay on how technology has (and has not) altered the way that we teach in higher education. The University has become the Gourmet Sausage Factory – and that every academic "whether oncampus or online and whether willingly or not, are inevitably, inescapably and inextricably bound up in this technical T&L r/evolution" (this issue, p. 80). This paper presents a case study of the "professional development by stealth" provided for academics and how this has led them to re-envision their pedagogical practices.

The last word

Returning to the meme that began this editorial, we could also say that if there were only one way to publish, then there would be no need for the *Journal of Learning Design*. Much of the world's academic publishing is in the hands of a very few megalithic publishing companies. They operate as commercial enterprises and you will find that your libraries, your colleagues, your students and even you will have to pay to access what you have written.

This journal does not belong to (or is not owned by) a publishing company, it does not charge you to read your work. The university where the journal's online home is hosted does not own it either. Further, and importantly, this journal will **never**, like some open access journals, charge you to publish¹.

The *Journal of Learning Design* operates through a Creative Commons (CC)² Licence which allows the free distribution of an otherwise copyrighted work. The copyright stays with the author(s) who give (unknown) others the right to share, use, and build upon a work that they have created, that is, they agree to non-commercial uses of their work.

You are free to:

Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format

Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material

for any purpose, even commercially.

The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms.

Under the following terms:



Attribution — You must give <u>appropriate credit</u>, provide a link to the license, and <u>indicate</u> <u>if changes were made</u>. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or <u>technological measures</u> that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

It is clear, from the submissions we receive each month and the downloads of the papers we publish³, that this system of shared knowledge is working. To this end, the recent receipt of royalties from EBSCO⁴, a leading provider of full text and bibliographic databases, surprised us. It would seem that some readers have accessed JLD papers through a commercial index rather

iii

¹ For a useful summary of the differing kinds of charges for publication, see http://aoasg.org.au/paying-for-publication>

² <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0>

³ More on this in our next general issue, Vol 8 No 3.

^{4 &}lt; https://www.ebsco.com>

than downloading the paper they were after from the original source⁵. Receiving money put us in an ethical conundrum – the Library of the Queensland University of Technology generously meets our modest costs and we proudly wave the open-access banner. And, if you work in a university, you will actually appreciate the difficulty, perhaps impossibility, of actually giving them money without invoices or established accounts!

The JLD solution – the money, around AUD\$280, was donated to the Australian Open Access Support Group⁶, a voluntary association based at the Australian National University, Canberra.





This information is offered in a spirit of disclosure and also to remind you as authors, readers and reviewers of this journal to let others know that work published here is freely available. The authors published in this journal offer their work in a genuine spirit of collegiality and the reviewers and editors give freely and unstintingly of their time. The common theme, the common mantra is of sharing, of teaching, of learning design. The best things in life are free.

Margaret Lloyd Nan Bahr

Queensland University of Technology, Australia

References

De Bono, E. (1992). Serious creativity: Using the power of lateral thinking to create new ideas. London: Harper Collins Publishers.

iv

⁵ <http://www.jld.edu.au>

⁶ < http://aoasg.org.au>