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**ABSTRACT**
A definition of flipped learning by the Flipped Learning Network identifies ‘The Four Pillars of F-L-I-P™’; Flexible learning environment, a change in Learning cultures, Intentional content, and the Professional educator. This case study concentrates on the ‘I’ and ‘P’, intentional content and the professional educator. Appreciative Inquiry is used to explore, from both a student and staff perspective, the following questions: when does learning and teaching start? what is our role in developing the online environment? what is the impact on our own academic practice in both the online and face-to-face learning environments? what is recognised and respected as ‘teaching’ and what is recognised as ‘learning’? and by whom? This case study will offer some recommendations relating to intentional content and the role of a professional educator that could be interpreted into most flexible learning approaches concluding with a model for a different mind-set for developing the online environment.

---

**Introduction and context**

The context of this case study is the ongoing evaluation of the design, development and delivery of an accredited Postgraduate Certificate in Academic Practice (PGCAP). This course is mandatory for all new full time and fractional faculty staff who do not have appropriate teaching qualifications or professional recognition. In 2015 the course development team redesigned the course, introducing a flipped learning approach. The key motivating factor for this was to make the most of the face-to-face days (Lawton, 2016). Student engagement is very much a part of current debates in higher education and the Teaching Excellence and Student Outcomes Framework (TEF) (Healey, Flint, & Harrington, 2014; Higher Education Academy, 2014; Kahn, 2017). The University of Wolverhampton was a participant in the ‘What works?’ Student Retention and Success Programme (2008–2011), and participation in this programme influenced course design across the University. As a course team we recognised that new members of staff may be ‘silied’ within their discipline areas and might not meet other new members of staff. We felt that we should enable a sense of belonging to a community of learners that would be mutually beneficial. Analysis within the What works? Project identified interventions that
can impact on nurturing belonging and on retention. Retention was not a factor within our course; however, satisfaction, engagement and a sense of belonging were important. We took the following approaches from 'What works?' into our course design:

- Supportive peer relations;
- Meaningful interaction between staff and students;
- Developing knowledge, confidence and identify as successful HE learners;
- HE experience that is relevant to interests and future goals (Thomas 2012 p. 15-16)

Initially, a flipped learning approach was introduced in one module, then two and now over all three modules. From the initial design of the course to the present, Appreciative Inquiry (AI) has been used to explore and evaluate the course with participants. AI was chosen in part as 'it provides a potentially unthreatening way of researching learning environments or academic cultures' (Cousin, 2009, p. 167). The focus of AI is on positive solutions and potential change. AI appreciates what works within a context and looks to see how that context can be explored, evaluated and developed. It encourages dialogue and co-creation. All students who attend this course are members of staff, including lecturers, technicians, demonstrators, researchers and research students who teach; therefore, there is a duty of care as a practitioner/researcher (Costley & Gibbs, 2006) to students, colleagues and the employer. I am very conscious that the impact of the team’s demonstrable learning and teaching approaches, including research on learning and teaching, has the potential for great impact on the wider student experience. I believe that we must 'practice what we preach’ (Donnelly, 2016).

The course is designed to showcase how different learning and teaching approaches can be used in both class contact time, the online environment and for assessment. For example, each module has a different assessment type: module one uses patchwork assessment (Jones-Devitt & Lawton, 2016); the next a case study; and the third a group mock validation event and an academic poster. These different types of assessment were chosen to challenge our students and offer them, through their own experience, different ways of assessing learning outcomes that did not rely on the more traditional essay or exam. As student-participants we were able to show them the validity and credibility of, for example, an academic poster as an alternative to a 3,000-word essay. By doing the poster themselves they were able to judge the skills, abilities and rigour needed to complete this task. Based on their assessment experiences as students we are now seeing changes to assessment practices designed and implemented by our students across different disciplines in the University.

The class-contact space is a large flat room that allows us to change seating arrangements and again shows colleagues how they might manage a flexible space that is conducive to different approaches to learning and teaching. The online space supports the face-to-face activities and vice versa; creating this space is the focus of this case study.
Flipped learning

The design of the course initially did not draw on a structured approach that could be identified as ‘flipped learning’ (Lawton, 2016). A very pragmatic approach was taken to consider issues such as how the course would fit with people’s ‘day jobs’. With the flipped approach we felt that there was a need to explain the expectations of engagement so that participants did not see the face-to-face days as the only time they had to ‘attend’.

There are many different definitions of flipped learning; the one that appealed is from the Flipped Learning Network:

“Flipped Learning is a pedagogical approach in which direct instruction moves from the group learning space to the individual learning space, and the resulting group space is transformed into a dynamic, interactive learning environment where the educator guides students as they apply concepts and engage creatively in the subject matter”.

The accompanying model, the four pillars of F-L-I-P™ (Arfstom, Hamden, McKnight, & McKnight, 2013) identifies the following:

- F = Flexible Environment
- L = Learning cultures
- I = Intentional content
- P = Professional educator

It is these last two areas that this case study focuses on. In 2017 a Flipped Learning Global Initiative was launched to establish a ‘worldwide coalition of educators, researchers, technologists, professional development providers and education leaders who are committed to flipped learning’ (Flipped Learning Global Initiative, 2017). It is currently focused on three ‘domains’: research curation and distribution; evolving best practices in flipped learning; and technology selection and implementation. There appears to be a rapid expansion in the use of flipped learning, and this view is supported by the membership of this coalition. It is difficult to find academic critiques of flipped learning; however, November and Mull (2012) offer a ‘Response to five common criticisms’ that they identify as: the role of the teacher; learner expectations; preparedness and accountability for this approach to learning; access to the online environment; and capacity and capability for the teacher to develop appropriate learning materials and activities.

While this critique is based on a particular framework of a flipped classroom within a school setting, what is expressed are concerns that can be heard in any sector. Dr Eric Mazur’s work in the early 1990s on peer instruction offered a framework for a flipped classroom based on instructional videos that are produced and used prior to face-to-face peer learning. This concept is just one approach and has expanded from the flipped classroom to flipped learning. Mazur is frequently cited in articles on the flipped classroom or flipped learning. What is important is that the effectiveness of peer instruction has been evaluated over a ten year period (Crouch & Mazur, 2001). The effectiveness of our flipped learning approach compared to a previous learning approach can be measured by an increase in student attendance and satisfaction with the face-to-face activities, engagement with the online environment, an increase in average grade achievement and student comments particularly related to the impact of this approach on their own practice.
Since the design of the course (2015/16) the context for ‘F’, a flexible learning environment, changed with the introduction of a new virtual learning environment (VLE) at the start of the academic year 2016/17. The course team became early adopters of the new VLE. This new ‘tool’, a commercial product, offered a much more flexible environment for developing a rich multimedia learning experience than the previous in-house system that had evolved since its introduction in 1997 with an upgrade in 2008 (Dale and Lane, 2007). We felt that though we had tried to create an interactive learning experience within our old VLE this was limited and that student perceptions were that it had mainly become a repository for learning materials. The new VLE enabled us to start with a ‘blank sheet of paper’, providing a new space for our intentional content. The introduction of the new VLE is part of a wider Digital Campus Transformation Programme (2015), which has a strategic focus on pedagogy supported by appropriate use of technology to enhance learning and teaching (Towers, Cooper, & Kirk, 2017). As ‘early adopters’ of the new VLE we were encouraged to try new approaches. In a Jisc survey (Beetham, Newman, & Sarah, 2018) 61% of university teachers said that they felt that technology should be used in the classroom more. The survey also states that,

“However, less than half of college and university teachers, find it easy to design and organise VLE materials, and only one in ten use it for collaboration or to try different activities with students” (Beetham et al., 2018, p8)

This is exactly what we hoped to explore with our students, offering them a different ‘mindset’ and way of thinking about the online environment. Our students (all members of staff) have been influenced by their experiences of flipped learning approach where the VLE is used for intentional content that supports peer learning in the face-to-face learning environment that they are then taking back into their own academic practice.

**Intentional content**

Intentional content enables the teacher to offer materials for students to explore in their own time to maximize the face-to-face interactions. Within the model of the four pillars of F-L-I-P™ (Arfstom et al., 2013), the following is stated:

“... They [professional educators] determine what
they need to teach and what materials students should explore on their
own ...”

I have a design background and am a visual learner and this notion of students exploring materials on their own triggered thoughts on exhibition design. When starting to plan out my module content my starting point was to draw out pathways that I would like my students to explore and how I could offer a structured but flexible way for this exploration. I was reminded of my previous experience of planning, presenting and offering choice when an exhibition is put together. A curator selects artefacts and arranges them in an exhibition that guides an individual to experience a mindful collection placed in a meaningful way. The individual is able to take what they want from that experience. They can manoeuvre around the exhibition at their own pace, deciding what to pass or linger over or return to. Reflecting on my actions to create the online environment I saw a number of parallels: I selected articles and videos;
I arranged them under themes; I set reflective questions and discussions to be considered on certain artefacts for people to linger over; and although I arranged the pages in a particular order, my students were free to access them in any way they wanted to. I curated the online experience as an individual learning exhibition and the face-to-face activities as a dynamic, interactive space for the exploration of ideas with peers that was mutually beneficial. What is fundamental is that the face-to-face activities are not a recitation, monologue or performance of the online materials.

**The professional educator**

The experience of curating the online environment, in turn, raised questions for me about where I started my teaching activity and what I defined that to be. The phrase ‘sage on the stage or guide at the side’ (King, 1993), though perhaps overused, does have a resonance to the professional educator. As a course team, we had to let go of the control of face-to-face sessions, stage managing rather than leading the activities. Each face-to-face day runs from 10:00-16:00 with a one hour break for lunch. The day is split into different sessions with a maximum one hour per session. The day starts with up to a 15-minute introduction and scene setting and finishes with up to a 30 minute question and answer and summary. Each one-hour session is managed by a different member of the team (between two and three on each day). For each session, if any materials are used they are taken from or added to the learning exhibition online space. We encourage group work and ask for summaries to be shared with the whole group; this can be through such things as concept maps, idea trees and bullet-points on flip-chart paper. We photograph these and add the digital images by the end of the next day. Students co-create and add to the intentional content. The focus of the face-to-face day is not on the teacher but on peer-to-peer learning and this changes the dynamics of the whole approach. In our modules students cannot replicate or replace the face-to-face learning by just looking at the online materials, each flexible space complements rather than replaces the other.

Our role in the face-to-face session is different from ‘the sage on the stage’: we set the scene, introduce and facilitate the activity, ask questions, summarise and pull together the session. As a team we have reflected on how we feel about the change in our roles and all identified that the preplanning of the intentional content and the change in our activity in the face-to-face days is rewarding; we feel that we are active learners gaining a vital understanding of our students’ very wide ranging learning and teaching contexts. Adult learners have a variety of experiences of life, which represents a rich resource for learning from peers (Knowles, 1990) and we forget that at our peril on a course where the students are our colleagues.

**Methodology**

Each year we ask our students about their experience on the modules and courses, what they liked, what could be improved and what needs to change. In addition on the module I teach, I wanted to explore what their thoughts were about intentional content and the professional educator. I saw these points as linked to the bigger question about our roles as teachers in a flexible learning environment.

AI has four phases, often referred to as the four ‘Ds’. Discovery, focuses on identifying what is best about the current situation; Dream imagines what could be; Design
plans what might be; and Destiny, (sometimes replaced with ‘delivery’) suggests what will be. After gaining ethical approval and informed consent during a face-to-face day, students were asked to consider the implications of being a practitioner / researcher, and this was supported by online materials. Participants were asked to discuss their ideas in peers groups of three from two different perspectives: firstly as a student and then secondly as a teacher. As a student they were asked to discuss and consider:

- **Discovery**: where and when did your learning start?
- **Dream**: what would you like to do in [the VLE]?
- **Design**: what will enhance your experience?
- **Destiny**: what changes need to be made?

From a teacher's perspective:

- **Discovery**: where and when do you think your teaching started?
- **Dream**: what could you do to make the most of [the VLE]?
- **Design**: what would make a difference to you to make this happen?
- **Destiny**: what changes need to be made?

As a group they added their thoughts to concept maps firstly from their student identity and then secondly from the role of a teacher. They were then asked to share their thoughts and ideas to the whole group. Those who wished to take part in the research could then submit their maps. 16 maps were submitted. There was no one definitive outcome, more a set of continuums of opinion; however, there were clear peaks where a majority of views resided.

**Findings and discussion**

**Discovery: (S) when does learning start? (T) when does teaching start?**

From the student perspective, the majority of participants commented that their learning started well before any face-to-face sessions. Some commented that as soon as they thought about starting the course their learning had begun. This included researching the course, looking at online information, reading lists and module guides. There was a barrier between initial learning and accessing specific learning materials in the VLE, as access relied on full enrolment and registration of modules. From a systems perspective, there seems to be a view that face-to-face teaching happens first and that this activity introduces a student to the online environment as a secondary or supportive activity. Though I had created an environment that could be navigated and explored without tutor intervention, the system would not allow this to happen.

From experiences with previous cohorts we recognised that a flipped approach to learning was not the expectation of the University, students or staff, so we added a half day induction prior to the first face-to-face day so that we could introduce the approach and allow time for students to sort out access to the online environment and to start engaging with the materials. This would mirror the first stage - Access and motivation - of Salmon’s five-stage model for successful online learning (Salmon, 2013).
Although this was effective for some, it was not the case for all. One way around this has been to create an open access module for all members of staff regardless of whether they are on the PG Cert or not. This has the same materials and reflective questions but not the course discussions or group pages. Without any real promotion, there are currently 215 participants in this online space.

The teacher perspective again showed a variety of responses along a continuum; however, there were more responses that indicated a belief that teaching started in the classroom. That said, a high proportion stated that by using the new VLE as a student had changed their view of teaching. They identified activities such as creating content, reflecting on the appropriateness of materials, creating student activities, curating routes through materials, creating structure, designing layout and exploring features such as online quizzes and discussions. The majority said that they would aim to create a fully online learning environment prior to teaching.

During their studies from the student perspective, they liked the co-creation and immediacy of having access to their peer-group thoughts (e.g. flip-chart paper) and that from the teacher perspective, this enabled them to see what progress and understanding their students had of the issues discussed. From the teaching perspective they would look for timely and appropriate communication with their students so that the online environment was flexible and dynamic. This would align with stage 2 - online socialisation - of Salmon’s model. In our course, online socialisation was not a priority, although we did set up online discussions and also created online group spaces for different activities. For example, in module one to enable teaching observation, in module two for peer sharing of resources related to different themes and in module three for group work for preparation of a mock validation event. In addition, a number of participants commented that as a teacher they would look to use video capture technology to add to the online environment during teaching, but more for clarification of key points from student comments, rather than videoing full lectures.

The experience of being a student using the new VLE had changed participants’ views on their own teaching, in particular how the face-to-face and online environments could support each other. Participants articulated that a fundamental aspect was that the face-to-face activities were not a recitation, monologue or performance of the online materials. Participants initially described giving students access to PowerPoint slides used in class, creating a linear, week-by-week structure; however, after offering a different approach, they identified activities such as creating content, reflecting on the appropriateness of materials, creating student activities, curating routes through materials, creating structure, designing layout and exploring features such as online quizzes and discussions as being more fulfilling for themselves and hopefully more engaging for their students. The majority said that they would aim to create a fully online learning environment prior to teaching that enhanced rather than repeated the face-to-face activities.

**Dream: (S) what would you like to do in [the VLE]? (T) what could you do to make the most of [the VLE]?**

From the student perspective, the participants would like more opportunities for discussion with peers and tutors. They would like more video clips from both course tutors; for example, explaining the assessment or providing more information about the
international higher education sector. The online environment currently has video clips from ten different HEIs including Delft University of Technology on constructive alignment, John Hopkins University on Blooms Taxonomy and University of Groningen on what makes a good university teacher. The importance of these resources is that our staff recognise that learning and teaching concepts, theories, issues and challenges are global not just local. Although more video clips from the course are desirable, it is acknowledged that videoing the peer-to-peer learning in a flipped learning approach may be difficult to capture, and that introducing a camera may change the group dynamics and may not accurately represent the student experience. It was suggested that we could video an introduction to the activity, upload any images created by the students and video any summing-up and feedback. Suggestions were made about features that are not currently used, such as live chat, that could be introduced with more than one teacher in the room.

There were a number of suggestions relating to the assessments, such as examples of previous work (this is already available) and a video unpacking the assessment expectations.

What students would also like to do, but which is not currently possible, is to reorganise the learning resources into a structure that works for them as an individual. They would like to add to and build their own ‘work / reference book’ adding materials that they found relevant. They can do this through a Wiki but this is a shared space rather than something that they would individually own.

From the teacher perspective, issues relate to keeping materials fresh, up-to-date and timely. In addition, colleagues thought they could make more of the features in the VLE to increase interaction such as quizzes, discussions, video capture, audio and video feedback. All thought that there should be more enabling of student engagement and that the use of the VLE by students should not be a passive experience where they just use it to catch up on missed lectures or where they download PowerPoints or handouts. There was a very strong feeling that the new VLE must not become a repository of teaching materials. Comments were made about guiding students, enabling discussions, reflection and creating student groups / communities for peer-to-peer support. There were some comments regarding giving students editing rights, the ability to add to materials and co-creating their online learning experience; however, this area had the most debate about knowing how best to manage this process so that no one group of views became dominant and that materials were appropriate. From the teacher perspective there were also comments about changing to more of a flipped approach now that the participants had experienced this as a student; however, it was also recognised that the online individual space needed to be seen as an integral part of the overall learning experience.

(S) what will enhance your experience? (T) what would make a difference to you to make this happen?

Students identified that they would like more short explanatory videos embedded into the different pages. Explanations of the assessment were seen as key but the students also wanted clarity about contextualisation of the materials to their own settings. The students would like short video clips discussing key concepts such as constructive alignment and how this can be taken into their own practice.
The students would like more external links to learning and teaching. One group commented that as they were new to teaching in HE, they were unaware of the scholarship relating to learning and teaching until they started on this course. There was a general feeling that discipline-specific learning and teaching conversations were important; however, they also valued seeing how other subjects were taught. They would also like to be able to make more links between theory and practice. One suggestion was that recordings of discussions could be made and uploaded, not just the pictures from the group work activities. All appreciated accessing the curated content as soon as they were able to. They liked how the content grew from their own activities, discussions and images, as the course developed as they felt that they had some ownership of the content.

There were some comments regarding the peer-to-peer group work all taking place in a large open classroom as being a little overwhelming. Two students who identified themselves as being on the autistic spectrum found the dynamic space too noisy and busy. I think as a course team we had forgotten that though we loved and appreciated the energy in the room we had not considered how we might have offered an equitable experience in a quieter environment.

Teachers felt that they needed student feedback on their experiences and what they would like to see kept, changed and enhanced. They felt that a change in learning culture where students engaged in discussions and group work with teachers and peers was needed. One group commented that students are currently passive consumers but it was up to us (teachers) to give them a rational and explanation for what studying in HE should be like. This comment was also reflected in the group discussion about actually having an articulated learning and teaching approach or framework (e.g. flipped learning). It was felt that whatever was used needed to be explained to students (and colleagues) so that all participants understood how to get the most out of the experience. It was felt that perhaps we (teachers) made too many assumptions about students' understanding of how they should learn in HE and how they would be taught.

Colleagues felt that they needed more knowledge on the functions of the VLE; however, in the discussion, this became more about approaches to learning and teaching and therefore how this could be done effectively rather than what button does what. They would like to have more examples of what colleagues are doing in other disciplines or scenarios (e.g. with large groups). They would like more time to learn, reflect, design and curate the online experience.

**What changes need to be made?**

Students wanted access to the online environment as soon as possible with embedded videos explaining how to use the resources. They would like to have videos from previous cohorts giving them hints and tips. They would like a clearer front page enabling easier navigation.

The students would like the course team to communicate to line managers that just attending the face-to-face days was not the only commitment expected on the course. They felt that the flipped learning approach was not understood by those who made decisions on their workload.

Although they valued having the curated materials at the beginning of the course the students wanted more opportunities to customise, create and add to their experience or to...
have a legacy impact on the next cohort, such as suggesting different options for patches in the patchwork assessment or new themes for the case studies and academic posters.

A key concern for teachers was time to implement change. They would like to have spaces for sharing creative practice, learning from each other and to get feedback from students on changes they would like to see. In particular, they want hints and tips on how to get students to do online activities for large groups. One idea was that there should be a minimum level of online activity that must be achieved to pass the module. In practical terms, this would be possible with the embedded learning analytics. In discussions, this raised issues of time to do this in a timely and effective way.

Another key concern was that there were few appropriate flexible physical spaces and that these were often set out in traditional rows facing the teacher at a podium. Where there was flexible furniture in a room, the room could be very full, meaning that there was not the space to move around. Colleagues felt that the physical space constrained what they could do as a professional educator and pushed them more to the ‘sage on the stage’, and this in turn impacted on the learning and teaching approach they would like to take.

**Design: intentional content – digital curation**

Following on from the initial group concept maps, students who had self-identified as willing to take part in further focus groups of individual interviews were asked what would enable them as teachers to use the new VLE effectively. All commented that they valued an illustration of how they might plan their environments differently. One focus group talked about a ‘different mindset’. I offered my own experience and the notion of a ‘learning exhibition’, starting with the concept of digital curation.

Advance HE defines digital curation as, *the act of finding selecting, grouping and contextualising, preserving, maintaining, archiving and sharing digital content.* (Higher Education Academy, 2017). As teachers we guide students to, and select, materials for them from the very first reading list that we create. In the online environment the selection of multimedia content adds a different dimension. In discussions on what might facilitate a different mindset, participants identified that there is almost an overwhelming amount of media available and that to select relevant, appropriate and meaningful materials needed some framework. When selecting materials for the PGCAP, I set a number of parameters that included: video clips being no longer than 15 mins; being focused on issues rather than general learning, teaching and assessment; and if possible coming from as many different countries and institutions as possible.

I wanted students to see that concepts and theories such as constructive alignment (Biggs & Tang, 2011) were not just being used in a local or even UK context. Likewise, that students’ views on what makes a good lecturer were being discussed in different countries with similar outcomes. When putting the materials together they were grouped under key themes such as ‘what makes a good teacher?’ Rather than just presenting a PowerPoint, a narrative was created, in the first person, that placed, for example, a video with a reflective question ‘what do you think?’ This would be followed by ejournal articles with again a series of question such as ‘do you agree with this author?’ If not why not, or if you do why?’ 'How does this impact on your view of your own academic practice?'
As I started to collect, select and place materials wrapped around with narrative, it struck me that my activities drew on my previous experience of exhibition design. There was a purposefulness in placing artefacts in a particular way, some of which might be placed with more prominence while others might be placed into a group of ‘objects’ in some form of relationship or comparison. All had some narrative explanation, reflection, focus and direction. Intentional content in flipped learning I would suggest can, therefore, be a curated exhibition of artefacts to enable learning. It is more than a collection or repository.

The National Association for Interpretation (NAI) in the USA (a professional association for those involved in the interpretation of natural and cultural heritage resources in settings such as parks, zoos, museums, and historical sites) suggests that effective exhibitions build on someone’s previous knowledge, and that displays should be made which relate to and are relevant for them, (Toxey/McMillan Design Associates, 2007) similar to principles of andragogy (Knowles, 1990). The NAI further suggests that an effective exhibition engages visitors mentally by getting them to reflect, think and ask questions. Surely this is what we should be aiming for in a curated online environment?

The Higher Education Academy (HEA - now Advance HE) suggests that digital curation is an emergent pedagogy and gives the example of Curtin University, Australia, which has taken this concept into their blended learning strategy by making links to flipped learning (HEA, 2017). For me, the key concept is that prior to face-to-face activities, a meaningful online environment, and a ‘learning exhibition’ are created. In this flexible environment, we, the teachers, do not control what participants take away from their experience or how they ‘walk’ around and interact with the exhibits, but we do offer suggested routes, questions to reflect on and narratives and explanations.

In the PGCAP online course all the content pages are created and available to students as soon as they can access the materials. We add to these pages with contributions from peer-to-peer activities. For example the page ‘what makes a good teacher?’ is added to with digital images of flip-chart student discussions and ideas. The resource grows. We might then consider what is preserved, maintained and archived in collaboration with the material creators.

Some members of staff articulate a fear that if all materials were available from day one then why would students attend lectures? In the UK in student chat groups, blogs and news articles (The Guardian, 2015, Is missing lectures harming my studies?) there is much discussion on the merit of a lecture. If the face-to-face experience is just a presentation, regurgitation or presentation of what you can get online then why would you attend? If the only online materials are videos of the lecture then why attend in person, as you can watch the presentation of information at a place and time of your own choosing. If however, in a flipped approach the face-to-face contact is a dynamic group experience supported by a designed-managed online exhibition then you will be missing out on an experience of learning with and from your peers that cannot be replicated.

**Design: professional educator**

If you accept that there is a role for digital curation within a flipped learning approach then this adds to the skills set of a professional educator. I would argue that our ‘teaching’ starts as soon
as we consider how and what we want our students to experience in a learning exhibition. The focus moves from our teaching materials, what we will use within face-to-face activities (e.g. PowerPoint slides, handouts etc.) to an exhibition for individuals to engage with. Our activities in a flexible learning environment focus on an individual’s experience within a managed curated space. To create the online environment we reflect, make selections, offer questions and create narratives for our students; we then let them take what they need and want.

Our role within the face-to-face activities is not as a performer, ‘sage on stage’, but as co-creators with our students making sense of their and our experiences. Some of my students initially viewed teaching as something that started in the classroom; however, by considering intentional content and the role of the professional educator this view changed. So when does teaching start? As soon as you put the idea of a module or course together. Intentional content starts the curation of a learning exhibition and as a professional educator you are ring-master, facilitator or ‘guide at the side’.

Participants identified a number of things that they initially believed would enable them to change their practice. Issues of workload, time and priority were first articulated; however, when discussing the flipped approach - moving to the ‘guide at the side’ rather than ‘sage on the stage’ (King, 1993) - the session planning moves from ‘what am I going to teach?’ to ‘what will my students be doing and learning?’ It was acknowledged that the preparation, planning, curation and design was front-loaded but that this enabled a different engagement with students once ‘teaching’ had started. Maintaining a sustainable environment was perceived as less time-consuming once a rich online environment had been designed. Participants as teachers commented that they enjoyed looking for new materials to challenge students and themselves. Digital curation did not require the creation of new materials but the collection, selection, repurposing and creation of learning around existing artefacts. The new creation came by the way the materials were exhibited.

Participants suggested that moving away from a linear, week-by-week curriculum design allowed them to be more flexible and responsive to student needs. They felt that they could spend more time on problematic areas and threshold concepts (Meyer & Land, 2006) that were supported by a rich online environment for individual engagement.

One area that was raised was the physical learning environment impacting on the ability to do group work. More flexible learning spaces are becoming the norm, with less emphasis on lecture theatres. Participants suggested that it requires a shift in academic practice to work effectively within those spaces.

**Conclusions**

This case study does not necessarily offer anything new but seeks to shine a light on two aspects of a flipped learning approach that are relevant to this and other flexible pedagogies.

From my students’ perspective, their learning starts as soon as they are able to access course information. There might be a barrier between initial research on the course and gaining access to learning materials. One view is that traditional learning starts in the classroom where flipped learning starts before face-to-face activities. Our teaching starts as soon as we think about developing a module or course. We could see our role
developing intentional content as being similar to an exhibition curator. This in turn, has an impact on our activities and identity as professional educators.

**Destiny/delivery**

For many of us our class-contact time is the activity that is recognised in our workload allocations and is the time reported in public domains, (e.g. Unisats web site). I would argue that the activities of a professional educator in a flipped approach are harder to define and quantify and perhaps do not give a true representation of academic practice within flexible learning pedagogies.

From an AI approach, my students and I would recommend that:

- Expectations of learning and teaching hours are clearly explained in flipped/ flexible learning approaches
- Students are able to interact with peers and tutors in the online and face-to-face activities
- All intentional content is available at the start of a course and that those additions are made where appropriate
- The role of professional educator is recognised when using flexible pedagogies.

I propose and offer a different mindset towards the creation of an online environment within a flipped learning approach. The conceptual thinking of creating a learning exhibition offers a different approach to academic practice. I would argue that designing a learning exhibition moves the narrative away from ‘what am I going to teach?’ to ‘what do I want my students to experience and learn?’ and allows them to explore, discover and take away the learning that is meaningful to them.
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