

Sustaining Continuous Professional Development For Quality Teaching And Learning In Higher Education: The Role Of Policy And Policy Implementers

Annyza Binti Tumar
Sunway University, Malaysia
annyzat@sunway.edu.my

Soaib Asimiran
Universiti Putra, Malaysia
soaib@putra.upm.edu.my

Zaidatul Akmaliah Lope Pihie
Universiti Putra, Malaysia
zalp@putra.upm.edu.my

Ismi Arif Ismail
Universiti Putra, Malaysia
ismi@putra.upm.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Continuous professional development (CPD) is important for academics to improve the quality of their teaching and their students' learning. This paper reports the findings of a qualitative case study on CPD support at a Malaysian private university. It reports the perceptions of institutional leaders and academics on existing CPD support and how such support can be increased. Data was derived from interviews and teaching observations while factual verification was obtained through document analysis. Findings indicated the institution was supportive of its academics' CPD needs through top-down measures including policies and guidelines, and provision of different on-site CPD models. However, there were some gaps between areas of CPD needs and areas supported. One implication was that existing policy gap could be reduced through policy review and revision. Another implication was a need for academic heads to go beyond their role as policy implementers by identifying, initiating and supporting specific CPD needs at the departmental level.

Keywords: CPD, Higher education policy, quality teaching

INTRODUCTION

There has been a significant increase in access to higher education institutions (HEIs) in Malaysia in the last decade. Student enrolment in Malaysian HEIs in 2012 was 1.4 million, with 455,000 enrolled in private HEIs. (Ministry of Education, 2015). With the country's intention to become a higher education hub in the region, this number is expected to increase. By 2025, private HEIs are expected to have grown to accommodate the increase in student number, projected at 2.5 million. They are not only expected to grow, they are also expected to take the lead in providing HE access, especially for international students, surpassing public HEIs at 56% student enrolment (Ministry of Education, 2015). This is an indication of a positive change of perception towards private HEIs. In the past, private HEIs were often regarded as profit-making organisations that were impartial towards improving quality (Wilkinson & Yusof, 2005) due to its costly process (Tan Ah Mei, 2002). Now, they are regarded as genuine and strong contributors to the field, complementing the contributions of public HEIs (Wilkinson, 2015). With their important role, there is a need for private HEIs to find ways to improve the quality of teaching and learning provided because it is an important determinant to quality graduates.

"Quality of teaching" is a concept that often comes with multiple-meanings. In HE, what constitutes as quality teaching and what it takes for teaching to be considered as high quality is context, discipline and subject-dependent (Skelton, 2004). It is impacted by environmental factors even beyond the classroom (Linblom-Ylane, Negvi & Trigwell, 2011). Biggs (1999) proposed quality teaching as one that facilitates students' adoption of deep approaches to learning. Evidence also shows that increased deep approaches to learning has a direct correlation with higher class of awards for degrees obtained at undergraduate level (Trigwell, Ramsden, Prosser & Martin, 1999.) This means that lecturers would focus on students and their learning environment, motivating them to participate, engaging them, developing their independence and providing them with a supportive learning environment (Knight & Trowler, 2000). Quality teaching also means lecturers that are concerned with what their students actually do in the teaching and learning process and how the lecturers can facilitate their students' learning by engaging them in meaningful activities and assessments (Biggs, 2001).

CPD and Its Role in Enhancing Teaching and Learning Quality

Teaching is not a natural talent. Lecturers do not learn to understand their students' conception of learning and how learning outcomes are achieved within the environment they are in by relying on their own experiences as students of higher learning. Just as students can opt for minimal, surface approach to learning, so can lecturers adopt a surface approach to teaching where they focus on themselves and what they do as lecturers, how much they need to cover and teach. As an institution, HEIs often recruit or promote teaching staff less for their excellence in teaching but more for other reasons which include their academic qualifications, publications and the research grants they can bring to the institutions (Partington & Stainton, 2003). Both of these situations point to the need for developing lecturers' pedagogical knowledge and skills. Lecturers need CPD that is holistic and addresses the progression of their thinking so that they could encourage development of deep approaches to learning in their students. Lecturers also need to develop these skills in relation to their subject area, the programmes and the institution that they are teaching in. In this respect, CPD for lecturers can come adopt different models (Kennedy, 2005), come in many forms for different purposes of development, and be formal or informal in nature (Park et.al, 2007; Ingvarson, Meiers and Beavis, 2005).

In supporting and sustaining CPD, private HEIs need to reflect and adopt the right approach. It is important that they ensure that they support the kind of CPD that have impacts at four levels: teachers' knowledge, belief and practice, and students' outcome (Lipowsky, 2004, cited in Roesken, 2011). This would ensure that they would be able to increase their graduate quality and promote staff retention (Ministry of Education, 2015). To achieve enhancement of teaching and learning quality through CPD, these institutions need to be reflective at three levels (Biggs, 2001). First, they need to be explicit about their espoused theories which influence decisions made about teaching. Next, they need to put in place built-in mechanisms which allow consistent assessment of current practices and how improvements can be made. Third, they also needs to take action to remove obstacles to quality teaching. The policymaking and policy implementation process within that institution should also assist in its continuous reflection and change (Soaib & Suffean, 2012).

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Addressing the complex nature of CPD for quality teaching and learning in HE requires multiple factors to be taken into account. It needs to take into consideration students' learning needs, staff's development needs, institutional vision in the quality of graduates it intends to produce and their potential economic and social contribution to society. It also needs to take into consideration the resources that are available to the institution. It is probably through consideration of these multiple-factors that many HEIs developed their strategies for CPD and the policies and guidelines related to it. It is also through consideration of these factors that an HEI can review its current CPD support and provision in order to improve them.

Soft systems theory formed part of the theoretical framework for this research. Through application of soft systems theory, a systemic process of inquire was carried out to allow a better understanding of the situation and identify proper actions to be taken (Checkland, 2000). This research applied the appreciative systems theory derived from soft systems theory in order to understand how CPD for quality teaching and learning could be sustained within the institution. (Vickers cited by Checkland, 1994). The appreciation process involved: (1) selection from reality, i.e. relevant key ideas, stakeholders, action that had been taken; (2) perception of some aspects of institutional reality and making judgments about it, i.e. to what extent had action been taken to organise and implement CPDs and to what extent had the implementation of these CPDs actually helped lecturers improve teaching and learning; (3) contribution of ideas for modified or improved action that could solve the situation. The appreciative system is constantly open to further input based on the ideas and activities that are carried out in the appreciation process.

Situated learning theory formed the other part of the theoretical framework for this research. Literature identified four elements integral to successful CPD framework in HE (King, 2005). Firstly, CPD of all aspect of lecturers' role was normalised. Secondly, CPD modes were contextualised to the institution, the discipline and the lecturers' themselves, with the lecturers having autonomy in choosing which modes of CPD suited them best. Thirdly, the complex nature of CPD meant that it could occur in different settings, both formally and informally, involving different types of activities; therefore, it was important that institutional support of CPD recognised this complexity. The final element was inclusion of professional collaboration as crucial, involving conversations between lecturers with their colleagues in the same department, with lecturers in other departments and with those whose role were to support teaching. These four elements brought forth the relevance of situated learning theory, which views learning as something which occurs between people and is distributed through interactions that govern what is learnt and how it is learned (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Learning is influenced by physical and social context (Putnam & Borko, 2000; Cobb & Bowers, 1999) and therefore, knowledge that is gained is indivisible from the

context in which it was derived. Learning is “fundamentally situated” (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989). Knowledge is also seen as a co-product of an activity, context and culture within which it is being developed (Brown, Collins & Duguid, 1989).

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative case study approach to gain an in-depth understanding of the complex issue of CPD and CPD support within a private HEI, where multiple other factors have an influence on over it. The case institution selected is one of the oldest private higher education provider in the country. It was placed at tier 5 in the SETARA 2009, 2011 and 2013 rating, a Malaysian rating instrument which measures teaching and learning quality (MQA, 2015). Purposive and snowball sampling were used to select research participants. There were 14 participants. Three were professors who formed part of the institution’s senior management, another 3 were a professor and two associate professors who were part of their faculty’s management team and heads of at least one department within their faculty. Another 8 were novice and experienced lecturers holding the position of either lecturers, senior lecturers and one associate professor.

Data Collection and Analysis

Semi-structured interviews were conducted and audio-recorded. A naturalised approach to transcription which focused on informational contents of the sessions was adopted (Oliver, Serovic & Mason, 2005). Idiosyncratic elements were removed. Transcriptions were validated through member checking (Cresswell, 2013). Themes which emerged were then identified and categorised.

Research Questions

1. What are the lecturers’ perception about their CPD needs to improve teaching and learning?
2. What are the participants’ perception about the institution’s support for CPD for quality teaching and learning?
3. How can CPD support for enhancement of teaching and learning quality be improved?

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

All names used to refer to participants in this section and the discussion section are pseudonyms.

The meaning of quality teaching and learning in the context of the case institution

All the participants had similar perceptions to the meaning of quality teaching and learning in their context. They identified four factors which contributed to quality teaching and learning: (1) the curriculum, (2) the lecturers, i.e. the knowledge and experience that they brought to the classroom, (3) provision of learning opportunities that went beyond the classroom, and, (4) teaching, learning and technological resources available to them.

Lecturer and student indicators of quality teaching and learning

There were ten indicators of quality teaching and learning that participants perceived to be identifiable in lecturers and their teaching. The ten indicators identified were: (1) content mastery, (2) pedagogical knowledge, (3) skilful teaching, (4) clear expectations, (5) coherent delivery, (6) connection and application to real life, (7) passionate and engaging, (9) quality assessments, (10) support for learning, and, (10) inclusiveness.

In addition to the ten indicators observable in the lecturers and their teaching, there were seven student indicators of quality teaching that were identified. These were: (1) attainment of learning outcomes, (2) good exam performance, (3) criticality in thinking, (4) internalisation of values, (5) application of learning, (6) problem-solving, and, (7) contributions to society. Some of these indicators could be observed during the course of the semester teaching and at the end of the course. Others could only be observed later.

Perception of CPD needs to improve teaching and learning

All lecturers identified almost similar areas of CPD needs for the enhancement of their teaching and learning. However, what they needed to develop within those areas had a slightly different focus. Both novice lecturers and experienced lecturers identified ‘content mastery’, ‘pedagogical knowledge and skills’ and ‘student engagement’ as the three main areas for development. Novice lecturers were concerned with building their knowledge and skills in these three areas to a level that they perceived to be adequate in order to teach reasonably well. They felt that their existing knowledge and skills were insufficient. In contrast, experienced lecturers reported that they had experienced similar needs when they were novice lecturers themselves. However, at the present stage of their career, they had already reached a level of content mastery and were confident with their pedagogical knowledge and skills. Their needs for these three areas had shifted, focusing more on enhancement rather than building a

base. For content mastery, experienced lecturers reported confidence in their existing content knowledge but also reported the need to keep current with latest research and development in their discipline and industry. In the area of pedagogical knowledge and skills, they reported the need to enhance existing skills and explore newer approach and teaching tools that could help their students learn better. In the area of student engagement, both novice and experienced lecturers shared the same amount of concern of concern. They all shared the concern of engaging students from different generations who were hyper-connected and easily distracted. Novice lecturers needed to develop their skills and strategies in engaging their students. In addition to that, with increasingly diverse student population comprising of local and international students from various countries, increasingly larger classes, all lecturers identified student engagement as an area that they needed to develop and improve further.

Existing institutional CPD Support for enhancement of teaching and learning

It was found that institutional support for CPD was most visible at two levels – at institutional level and at departmental level. Additionally, it was found that institutional level support focused mostly on formal forms of CPD which fitted with 6 out of 9 CPD models identified as the most common forms of CPD supported by HEIs (Kennedy, 2005). The 9 models identified by Kennedy were award-bearing, training, standards-based, cascading, action research, deficit model, communities of practice (CoP) and transformative model (a model which combined two or more of the earlier models). Of these, institutional level support focused on the following 6: award-bearing, training, standards-based, cascading, action research and transformative model. Support for CoP at this level was newly initiated and still at its infancy. Examples of CPD activities fitting with these 6 are illustrated below.

Support at institutional level

At institutional level, active support was available for some postgraduate qualifications, for example masters' degree and especially PhD as well as a postgraduate certification in academic practice (Award-Bearing Model). The support was evident in policy and guidelines which described the form of available support, i.e. financial, time and in some cases, the provision of the programmes themselves. However, there were other postgraduate qualifications viewed to be important by lecturers to enhance their teaching which were not supported. One example is professional exams related to a technical discipline area.

In collaboration with its' international partner which was ranked in the top 1 per cent for research and teaching (University Rankings, n.d.), the institution provided a development programme aimed at improving understanding of quality assurance and quality enhancement processes for teaching and learning. Lecturers from each of the faculties had or would have an opportunity to participate in this annual programme held at the international partner's campus and upon their return, shared their experience and what they had learned in a sharing session (Transformative Model – combining Training, Standards-Based, Action Research and Cascading).

There was also clear support at institutional level for local and international conference presentations based on scholarly activities or research work (Transformative model - with varied model combinations). Financial and time support for such activities were evident in the relevant institutional policies and guidelines. As part of the requirements, conference presenters had to present their papers internally upon returning, thus expanding this CPD activity (Cascading Model). Participants reported that such support was important to their development and that whether they presented on specific research on teaching and learning or on their discipline area, with purposeful reflection and application, it led to enhancement of their content mastery which led to enhancement of teaching. Steve, for example, reported that as someone relatively new to teaching, he gained a lot of knowledge from presenting his own research and listening to others share what they had done. It gave him opportunities to participate in professional conversations on his discipline area which gave him ideas that he explored in his own teaching.

In addition, through its Teaching and Learning Unit, the institution also provided a series of formal training sessions and workshops that aimed towards improving teaching and learning. Some of these workshops included workshops on Outcome-Based Education or OBE (Training Model), curriculum development and assessment strategies (Transformative Model -combining Training and Standards-Based models), classroom and student-management, reflective teaching, problem-based learning and experiential learning (Transformative Model - combining Training, Cascading and Action Research). Some of these workshops were facilitated by Malaysian and or international experts in the area while other workshops were facilitated by the institution's own experienced academic staff recognised as champions of CPD in their areas. The Teaching and Learning Unit also facilitated institutional support on a community of practice which focused on blended learning. However, this was still relatively new.

Support at departmental level

All department heads and lecturers agreed that CPD should occur more at departmental level. At this level, support for semi-formal and informal CPD was found. It involved one or more of the following: (1) CPD activities initiated and supported by department heads, (2) CPD activities initiated by staff and supported by department heads, (3) collaborative initiation and sustainment of CPD activities by department heads and staff. The models of CPD supported at departmental level were coaching, mentoring, communities of practice, action research and transformative models.

Despite their support of the CPD choices of their subordinates, as governed by institutional policies, two of the heads of department were more active than the third, in initiating CPD activities for the specific purpose of improving teaching and learning. This could be linked to the demography of their subordinates, where the heads positioned themselves in relation to teaching, and what the department heads perceived to be needed for their staff to develop their teaching.

Professor Alan and Associate Professor Wendy both had “very experienced” and “very good teachers” in their departments but at the same time, also had novice lecturers with little to no experience when they joined the department. With more than 30 and 20 years of experience teaching in Malaysia and internationally, they viewed leadership, support and provision of professional development opportunities within the department as a crucial aspect of their role as the head of department. They used existing quality assurance processes such as moderation of coursework and final exam papers, marking and second-marking of answer scripts to initiate informal CPD activities by pairing novice and experienced lecturers to work together (Transformative model – combining cascading, standards-based and action research). Through the discussions and feedback exchanged between both parties, lecturers could improve their assessment strategies and this could lead to reflection and improvement of teaching and learning strategies and teaching materials.

Both reported their own active engagement in developing their staff (Mentoring/Coaching models). However, both had not actively promoted CPD within their departments through peer observation or co-teaching although they supported staff who wanted to carry out teaching observation of their peers and had previously assigned two lecturers to co-teach a subject for functional purposes. Both viewed this as a sensitive area which had to be dealt with carefully so that signals, intended or otherwise, were not sent to others that one party was lacking in some ways and needed to be taught by the other. As stated by Wendy:

I start with moderation first, you see. So they don't feel it. The co-teaching thing, some people may be very defensive. Some people get very threatened because they feel, "What if in the midst of co-teaching, people discover I'm not so good?" You know, all the insecurities, so you've got to be very diplomatic and scientific about it. So it starts with moderation. So I pair them with moderators who are, let's say my X's [teaching] score is below three, I will pair X and Y who has fantastic teaching [score].

Associate Professor Simon viewed his teaching staff as being equally strong in teaching. In relation to the need for CPD for improving teaching and learning in his department, he stated:

I think generally, there's not, no major complaints but, I mean, to me, no complaint does not mean that there are no challenges. But I've gone in and observed some of them, most of them. But after observing most of them, I think generally our lecturers are okay.... We are all competent, you know. Some are more competent than others but I don't see anybody incompetent.

While acknowledging that there were areas of development needed, Simon viewed such developments as a departmental need requiring lecturers to break away from their existing mental model about teaching in order to be more creative and explorative in their teaching. He cited the changing student demography and increased class sizes as reasons for doing so. He viewed himself, as the head of department, as the one to lead this effort but were constrained by his teaching and management responsibilities.

Two lecturers in another department reported that most lecturers in their department were engaged in two communities of practice that were subject specific and with overlapping participation. These CoPs, one initiated and facilitated by Siti, another initiated and facilitated by Steve with Siti's mentoring, resulted in active participation by lecturers teaching the subject and were viewed by the participants as successful in addressing administrative, teaching, learning and assessment concerns they had in a collaborative and supportive manner (Transformative – combining CoP, Action Research and Cascading). In addition, through the initiation of their head of department, peer collaboration in the form of peer observation and co-teaching for mutual learning was a normalised CPD practice (Transformative – combining Action Research, Mentoring, Coaching). Steve and Siti also reported their department head facilitated this by addressing relevant systemic issues such as class scheduling and workload allocation. Although their heads would introduce complementary partnerships to facilitate collaboration, lecturers in the department were encouraged to choose CPD activities which worked for them.

Although members of 4 departments reported mostly active level of CPD initiation and engagement, a member of a 5th department reported a contrast. Diana felt that pursuit of professional development in her department was very much an individual process, with her head of department focused on administrative issues and other concerns within the department. While she had the option to choose her own CPD activities as provided for by the institution, she also had to ensure that they did not interfere with her responsibilities within the department, as required by her head of department. Although there was very little CPD activities to enhance teaching and learning, Diana considered that there were still many CPD opportunities based on the workshops run by the Teaching and Learning Unit.

Improving Institutional Support, the Role of Policy-Makers and Policy Implementers

In general, all participants were of the view that the institution was very supportive of CPD for improvement of teaching and learning. Of the 9 CPD models commonly used in HE, support was given in different forms and at different levels, for 8 of the 9 models. Department heads and the university's senior management chose to take a positive approach to CPD and therefore did not support the deficit model, in which a lacking in certain areas were identified and then formed part of a CPD curriculum. CPD activities were organised to meet lecturers' and institutional needs but some sensitivity in this area resulted in these activities being viewed and promoted as developmental activities. In addition, the institution appeared comprehensive in its support for CPD. Improvements in CPD support were still possible, after careful consideration of the multiple factors involved, including the institution's financial resources.

Firstly, there were some areas in which policy revision was needed. In accordance to that, some guidelines and implementation strategies needed to be reviewed. One of these areas was in relation to CPD support for award-bearing, postgraduate qualifications. Participants felt that to improve the quality of their teaching, PhDs were beneficial for some but not for others. Michael pointed out the need for him to take professional exams because his area was a technical area and by having sat for and passed the professional exams, he would have been able to guide his students better. Part of his programme's learning outcomes was for the students to obtain their degree and pass their professional exam. Yet, the institutional policy did not include such CPDs. This prevented him from obtaining financial support, despite his head of department's attempt to promote a change.

Secondly, while policy for conference participation and presentation were generally viewed to be good, there were areas that needed some revision and flexibility. One was that the amount of financial support given for international conference. The amount that was allocated for international conferences, especially those that were held outside South East Asia was viewed to be inadequate. As Professor Alan stated:

There's some obviously good policies in terms of the research support although the funding is, is poor. You know, you can't / The ringgit is not [a] strong currency. You can't, you know, if you want to build your reputation and you want your staff to feel good about their achievements and they want to go to the conference in their area that happens to be in Paris, they need to be able to do that without it costing them personally.

Another area for reviewing is the funding of one author only for conference presentations and funding for conference participation without a presentation limited to within the city or the state. Novice lecturers like Steve found that conference attendance beneficial to their learning as they were able to network, participate in professional conversations about teaching and their subject area. Conferences in his subject area were not always held within the city or state, and the requirement to present made this type of CPD very challenging for a novice. He stated, "... that TEFL conference that I went to. There's so many interesting sessions but it's a very big hurdle. I have to do research and present."

Thirdly, it was recommended that a policy that made it mandatory for novice lecturers and new lecturers to attend certain CPD modules as part of their probation requirement be introduced. This meant that lecturers who did not meet this requirement will not gain confirmation of their position. At present, these lecturers were encouraged to attend some basic modules, especially novice lecturers. However, there is nothing that compels them to do so. Since novice lecturers were the ones reporting more CPD need for basic knowledge and skills, the institution needed to ensure that such needs were addressed through its policy. Such a policy would also benefit lecturers who were new to the institution but had some teaching experience at other institutions. The uniqueness of one private HEI from another, i.e. different focus, different disciplines, different student demography meant that there would likely be differences in the ways to achieve quality teaching.

In connection to the above, time for professional development for lecturers new to teaching or new to the institution could be built into their workload. As an example, some gap in the time that the lecturers started work at the institution and the time when they were required to teach would enable them to attend some formal CPD modules

as well as participate in other CPD activities either at departmental level or individual level. Alternatively or in addition to this, one day per week could be blocked for CPD activities, at least for the first six months prior to their confirmation. The teaching and learning unit, therefore, would need to ensure that at the very least, their basic CPD modules were offered more frequently to fulfill the needs of new lecturers hired throughout the year.

Fifth, the institution's Teaching and Learning Unit could solicit more comprehensive feedback from faculty members regarding their CPD needs in order for their programme offerings to meet the needs of more staff. All the senior members of the university management team, the heads of departments and most of the lecturers interviewed agreed that the institution had various internal talents who were experienced in teaching or their content area or both. While university's senior management saw these talents' involvement in internal CPD activities, other research participants felt that these internal talents were under-utilised and their strengths not tapped into. Doing so would enable more CPD activities that were concrete, based on the lecturers' teaching and learning needs and immediately applicable to their teaching situations to be organised.

Sixth, improvements of CPD provision needed to be evidence-based. Data related to the extent that teaching and learning activities were actually improved and sustained was needed. At present, participants indicated that data on perceived effectiveness of formal sessions held in relation to the facilitators and the contents were available through participant feedback form distributed and completed at the end of each session. But to what extent these sessions led to teaching improvements was under-reported. If knowledge and skills gained from CPD activities did not result in changed / improved teaching practices, this gap needed to be addressed. If it did, the information could be shared with others,

Finally, given the high value of CPD activities occurring at the specific departmental level, the role of departmental heads as the leader, driver and champion of CPD needed to be made more explicit, and not left to the discretion of individual department heads, as evident in the case of the 4 departments with active CPD level and 1 department which had yet to achieve it. While the 3 department heads had gone beyond their role as policy implementers to champion CPD initiatives in their department, another had not. When the role of department heads as the leader, driver and champion of CPD is made more explicit, with possible policy and guidelines, CPD activities at this level would be more consistent and not left to individual awareness. However, some department heads may need their own CPD support to enable them to champion the enhancement of teaching and learning quality through CPD located in their departments.

Challenges in Making Improvements

Of the seven recommendations given above, some may be easier to implement than others because they were also dependent on the institution's financial and manpower resources. In addition, while CPD for enhancement of teaching and learning quality was an important concern, it was not the institution's only concern. As a young university aiming towards becoming more recognised and better ranked in the local and international ranking system, the institution's senior management needed to be careful so that all areas of development needs were similarly supported. While there was a general recognition that institutional support for CPD had improved and should continue to improve, increased financial support in some areas might not be the decision that the institution itself wanted to make.

Quite understandably, the institution might have chosen to support CPD areas in which both the staff and the institution stood to gain more. A case in point was the support for PhD but not for professional exams. Given that they needed to manage their finance better and make it stretch further, supporting PhD would increase the institution's staff strength and PhDs count in all important ranking systems. PhD holders gain knowledge and skills in research, with the expectations to conduct research and publish papers. Again, research undertaken and paper publications count in all important ranking systems. The same could not be said about professional exams. Another case in point is providing funding support for a conference presentation to the first or one author only, for papers with multiple authors. This was a conscious decision by the institution to ensure that the amount of fund spent should correlate to institutional gains.

CONCLUSION

The case institution offered strong support for CPD both at the institutional level and at departmental level. Both heads of departments and lecturers reported that the CPD activities that they had chosen to engage in were beneficial to the improvement of their teaching practices. With evidence of the extent to which improvements had occurred, the institution, whether through the initiative of its Teaching and Learning Unit or through CPD champions would be able to identify and strategise ways in which CPD provision could be improved. Revision of relevant policies and guidelines in order to accommodate lecturers' CPD needs while taking into consideration institutional needs and constraints would also enable more systematic and inclusive support for CPD at the level

that it needed to be supported. Beyond policy revision and changes, policy implementers could also explore ways in which opportunities for CPD could be created and sustained because policies cannot and should not prescribe everything. Finally, it needs to be reinforced that although CPD and CPD support are complex but necessary, they are among the many things that a young university needs to review and change for the better. As such, any form of changes need to be problematised and discussed by the stakeholders, and not be too drastic that they result in the institution being restricted from developing other areas.

References

- Biggs, J. (2001). The reflective institution: Assuring and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning. *Higher Education*, 41, 221-238.
- Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brown, J.S., Collins, A & Duguid, P. (1989) Situated Cognition and the Culture of Learning, *Educational Researcher*, 18, 32-42.
- Checkland, P. (2000). Soft systems methodology: A thirty year retrospective. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 17, S11-S58.
- Checkland, P. (1994). Systems theory and management thinking. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 38(1), pp.75-91. DOI: 10.1177/0002764294038001007
- Cobb, P., & Bowers, J. (1999). Cognitive and situated learning perspectives in theory and practice. *Educational researcher*, 28(2), 4-15.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative enquiry and research design: Choosing among the five approaches* (3rd ed.). California: Sage Publications.
- Ingvarson, L, Meiers, M. & Beavis, A. (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programmes on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes and efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(10)
- Kennedy, A. (2005). Models of continuing professional development: a framework for analysis. *Journal of In-Service Education*, vol. 31(2), pp.235-250.
- King, H. (2004). Continuing professional development in higher education: What do academics do? *Educational Developments*, 5(4). Retrieved from at http://www.seda.ac.uk/resources/files/publications_25_Educational%20Dev%205.4.pdf.
- Knight, P.T. & Trowler, P.R. (2000). Department-led cultures and the improvement of learning and teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, 25(1), 69-83.
- Lindblom-Ylanne, S., Nevgi, A & Trigwell, K. (2011). Regulation of university teaching. *Instructional Science*, 39, pp.483-495. DOI: 10.1007/S11251-010-9141-6
- Malaysian Qualifications Agency. (2015). SETARA ranking. Retrieved from <http://www.mqa.gov.my/>
- Ministry of Education (2015). *Malaysian education blueprint 2015-2025 (Higher education)*. Putrajaya: Ministry of Education.
- Oliver, D. G., Serovich, J. M., & Mason, T. L. (2005). Constraints and opportunities with interview transcription: Towards reflection in qualitative research. *Social Forces*, 84 (2), pp.1273-1289.
- Partington, P. & Stainton, C. (2003). Managing staff development. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Putnam, R. T. & Borko, H. (2000). What do new views of knowledge and thinking have to say about research on teacher learning? *Educational researcher*, 4-15.
- Roesken, B. (2011). *Hidden dimensions in the professional development of Mathematics teachers*. Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Skelton, A. (2004). Understanding 'teaching excellence in higher education: A critical evaluation of the National Teaching Fellowships Scheme. *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 451-468.
- Soaib Asimiran & Suffean Hussein (2012). *University governance: Trends and models*. Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya Press.
- Tan Ai Mei (2002). *Malaysian private higher education: Globalisation, privatisation, transformation and marketplaces*. London: Asean Academic Press.
- University Rankings (n.d). *QS Top Universities*. Retrieved from http://www.topuniversities.com/_qs-world-university-rankings
- Wilkinson, G. (2015). Are private and foreign education institutions better than public institutions? In Mei L.Y. (Chair). *19th Malaysian Education Summit 2015*, Sunway Lagoon Resort. 26th – 27th May, 2015.
- Wilkinson, R. & Yusof, I. (2005). Public and private provision of higher education in Malaysia: A comparative analysis. *Higher Education*, 50, 361-386