

THE UNIVERSITY OF MACAU
Faculty of Science and Technology
Department of Computer & Information Science

Dr. Kam Hou Vat

Statement of Service Philosophy

Background

It is my perception that virtually every college and university recognizes some kind of institutional service as being part of the responsibility of each faculty member. The philosophy sustaining my commitment in this important area of institutional service comes from my early reading of Robert K. Greenleaf's work on servant-leadership. I am deeply impressed by Greenleaf's legacies, as demonstrated through The Greenleaf Center for Servant-Leadership (<http://www.greenleaf.org/>). His seminal essay "The Servant as Leader" (Greenleaf, 1977, pp.21-61) constitutes my essential understanding of the origin and definition of what it means to be a servant-leader. In Greenleaf's own words, "Servant and leader - can these two roles be fused in one real person, in all levels of status or calling? If so, can that person live and be productive in the real world of the present?" I have to confess that this is a constant challenge, and I am learning to live up to this challenge day-by-day. It has inspired the living, loving and learning in my life, including my various services sustained at the University of Macau and beyond.

Meanwhile, it is also my observation that an organization's ability to learn is often a process of leveraging the collective individual learning of the entity so as to attain a higher-level organization-wide goal. This is a continuous process of creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge accompanied by a modification of individual and organizational behavior to reflect on new knowledge and insights. In this regard, I identify with Peter Senge (1990) that the organizations that truly excel in the future will be those that discover how to tap people's commitment and capacity to learn, and to produce a higher-level organizational asset. In the context of my workplace, I believe this could mean the restoration of a basic human drive to share what we know, which is indeed traceable to our historic hunter-gathers' organizing structure, providing a powerful testimony of the value of knowledge sharing in organizational growth.

My Framework of Servant Leadership

It is my conviction that the servant-leader is servant first as recounted by Greenleaf (1977, p.27) himself. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. This servant-first person is naturalistically different from one who is leader first, perhaps owing to a need to assuage an unusual power drive. According to Greenleaf, the difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first to ensure that other people's highest priority needs are being met, under a simple

rationale: Do those served grow as persons? Do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And, what is the effect on the least privileged in society or community? Will they benefit or at least not be further deprived? Admittedly, as we set out to serve, we could hardly know if this will be the result. At most, we simply act on the hypothesis and examine the result. Periodically, we might re-examine the hypothesis itself, and based on faith, we still choose the same hypothesis again and again. It is an open choice, and it is always fresh based on our personal growth experience. Greenleaf also reminds us that since the test of results of one's actions is usually long delayed, the faith that sustains the choice of the hypothesis is mostly psychological self-insight. That is considered the most dependable part of the true servant. The person who is servant-first, is characterized as one more likely to persevere and refine a particular hypothesis on what serves another's highest priority needs, than is the person who is leader-first, and who serves mostly in conformity with normative expectations. In retrospect, it is interesting to discover that Greenleaf's faith (1977, p.28) is based on his belief that among the legions of deprived and unsophisticated people are many true servants who will lead and that most of them can learn to discriminate among those who presume to serve them and identify the true servants whom they will follow.

My Appreciative Initiative as a Humble Steward

The word "appreciation" carries with it the recognition of the quality, significance, or magnitude of people and things, and a judgment or opinion, especially a favorable one, as well as an expression of gratitude according to *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th Edition. Therefore, being appreciative is feeling validated for our opinion, our efforts, and the unique qualities we bring to bear on a situation. In an appreciative initiative, it is perceived there is a deliberate action of selectivity and judgment, with which the humble steward, as an appreciative inquirer, is choosing to look at some stimuli intently and in the process, see them more fully. Interestingly, in the context of our workplace, this means when changing the way we perceive a new situation, we have the power to keep clear of the deficit thinking that is inherent in an organization, though the way we are trained mostly makes it easy to focus on the negative and what is not working in a situation. Put it more simply, any humble steward would agree that people who appreciate one another in the workplace will have a better working relationship than those who exercise no such relationship. David Cooperrider's (1986) doctoral research in appreciative inquiry at Case Western Reserve University has timely provided the context to search for the best in people, their organizations, and the relevant world around them. In its broadest focus, it involves systematic discovery of what gives life to a living system when it is most alive, most effective, and most constructively capable in economic, ecological, and human terms. It involves the art and practice of asking questions that should strengthen a system's capacity to apprehend, anticipate, and heighten positive potential for the common good. As a humble steward, I cannot but being appreciative. Namely, I must learn to experience any situation, accept the situation, make sense of the situation (pros and cons), and just as Thatchenkery and Chowdhry (2007, p.33) say, do a bit of mental gymnastics to understand the situation, with an appreciative lens. Not only that, the appreciative lens on the situation should impact my next experience as well. Speaking more literally, I must explore the life giving forces that

could sustain my servant-first commitment to lead my exploration: I must cultivate an image of a future by exploring the best of what is in order to provide an impetus for imagining what might be in experiencing life (Cooperrider & Srivastva, 1987).

My Endeavor in Learner-Centered Education

I am a believer of learner-centered education, which is, for a depressingly large number of students, still a new concept at the University of Macau. At the root of the quest for more learner-centered teaching comes this paradox: Students, the learners, may not be convinced. The underlying difficulty remains bringing the learners along. Students need to be persuaded that learning is the central purpose of their schooling. Oftentimes, students do not come to us believing this important context. And they are not necessarily comfortable with the idea of taking charge of their own learning. In fact, it is my observation that much of the apparent resistance of faculty members to new ways of teaching is rooted in the apparent intractability of students. The challenge is how we, college instructors, could recognize the authority of students as learners, give students responsibility for their own learning when, essentially, they would not take “yes” for an answer. Terry Doyle (2008) reminds us that if we want to improve the quality of undergraduate education, we need to start where we are, not where we wish we were, or where we think we ought to be. Doyle correctly identifies the biggest challenge in taking a learner-centered approach: getting the learners to buy into it so that they can understand how to learn most effectively. Doyle (2011) himself grapples with the hardest challenges that classroom teachers face when they try to give students responsibility for their own learning: getting them to work in groups, to give and take serious feedback on their work, to stand up and talk in front of a class, to take a deep approach to learning so that their learning will last a lifetime, rather than a surface approach that produces learning that will fade at the end of the semester. It is not uncommon to realize that if we were to foster student success we had to relearn how to talk to students, how to shape students’ tasks and roles, and how to engage them in designing their own learning environments. The message is clear: If the learning is going to get done, it is the students who are going to do it. I unknowingly have developed this belief myself: *I prefer to let students discover for themselves their own capacity as learners.* The rationale is simple: If they learn it for themselves, they really learn it. Undeniably, most of our students still shy away from taking responsibility for their own learning because they think it will make things harder for them. They think it will be more work, sometimes, with no clear reward. Admittedly, some of our faculty colleagues are a bit hesitant for the same reason. Yet, it is convinced that learner-centered education (deep approach to learn) can be richer without being harder and offer rewards that are not even accessible through the conventional teacher-centered transmission approach. It is hopeful that once they begin to see the long-term rewards, students and faculty alike will become engaged and committed to the learner-centered classroom. Furthermore, if a critical mass of teachers in a department or a faculty pursued learner-centered teaching as a goal, then it would multiply the benefits by orders of magnitude. As for students, if they came to see learner-centered teaching as normal, as the expected, as what most teachers do, effective teaching would be vastly facilitated, and we would be much closer to fulfilling the promise of elite education for all of our UM students.

My Commitment in Holistic Student Development

I am a strong advocate of holistic student development (HSD) which could be summarized in the Socratic dictum that “the unexamined life is not worth living.” It is convinced an effective and ideal college education is one that centers on HSD, including the search for meaning and purpose in life. In launching any HSD programs today, many a university has included important concerns of who a student is and becomes, as well as what a student does during college (Barkley, 2010; Braskamp, Trautvetter, & Ward, 2006). Universities guide students to become what the college thinks and believes is a desired end. They educate and work with students on purpose. In particular, colleges develop students in ways that recognize and build on their purpose in life, intellectually and morally. They intentionally create environments that center on purpose, helping students reflect on such questions as – Who am I? What are my goals in life? How do I want to make a difference with my life? Addressing questions such as a life good to live, is an important part of holistic student development across many campuses today. Tellingly, endeavoring to develop our full potential as human beings is certainly not only about financial achievement and professional success, but also living a life that is fulfilling and meaningful. Indeed, the HSD approach presses students to acquire knowledge and to develop a life of purpose; it challenges students to obtain and improve competencies and to know themselves; it also encourages students to engage the world and to probe the relevance and power of personal commitments, perspectives, and even their shortcomings. The question is how best to facilitate such student development. This renders a lot of my soul-searching to articulate an emergent model of virtual participation to help foster student success in college education, addressing such questions as: What does college education desire students to become? What skills and patterns of behavior do students need to learn and develop? How do members of the campus community – faculty, staff, and administrators – contribute to the development of students by who they are as well as what they do? It is convinced that the answer lies in the cultivation of a campus community of learning (CoL) (virtual and physical) comprising faculty dedicating themselves more fully to the totality of student life, schools making an investment in students as whole beings, and students themselves becoming personally invested in their college experience. In particular, this also renders challenges of how HSD could be enhanced if we could avail of the appropriate Internet technologies to support organizing online various student services, to be incrementally and empirically recognized as the unique *UM Experience* throughout their college years of living and learning as members of the campus community.

My Envisioning in Strategic Faculty Development

The University of Macau (UM) is currently operating without a strategic faculty development plan. It is believed that such a plan would strengthen UM’s ability to realize its mission and vision, uphold its values and education principles, enable student learning, and sustain teaching excellence into the future. Still, historically (before 2008) UM has invested in aspects of faculty development (like sponsoring existing teaching staff to complete their doctoral study) and starting in 2009, installed the first ever Centre for Teaching and Learning Enhancement (CTLE), to tackle issues of faculty development in response to demands of quality assurance in teaching and learning, as well as the sabbatical leave system articulated and installed in 2011 to reward hardworking and

productive faculty. Nonetheless, the call for a revised vision for strategic faculty development is not unreasonable for a young university reaching just beyond its 30th anniversary this past 2011. Faculty development is indeed a complex endeavor and includes such components as professional, instructional, leadership, scholarship, and organizational components. To capture this complexity, a multi-dimensional model that situates faculty as learners at its core just as that rendered at the NorQuest College in Canada in 2008 (http://www.norquest.ca/faculty/faculty_development/index.asp), sounds very appropriate. Put it briefly, the faculty development vision there is guided by such beliefs as: a) Learning about teaching requires practice and reflection; b) Faculty share responsibility for their learning with their students, peers, and administrators; c) Faculty who are learning have greater potential to be innovative and deal with change; d) Learning about leadership and scholarship in teaching and learning involves education, modeling, and guidance; e) Continuous evaluation of programs and services leads to their improvement; and f) Collaboration and experiential learning leads to greater job satisfaction.

Unquestionably, approaches to faculty development have not remained static over the years. For example, post-secondary institutions in Canada, that established faculty development offices in the 1990s focused primarily on improving teaching effectiveness (e.g., University of British Columbia and the University of Alberta). Over the years, faculty development (Wilcox, 1997; Ramsden, 2005; Milne, 2007; Merriam & Cafferella, 1999; Gappa et al., 2007) in North America encompasses activities that could be characterized by a number of terms, focusing on improving the quality and effectiveness of educational programs within the institutions of higher education:

- *faculty development* emphasizing on improving teaching skills
- *instructional development* emphasizing on student learning by improving courses and curriculum
- *educational development* emphasizing on a movement to improve quality through education in many areas, an emerging profession indeed
- *professional or academic development* emphasizing on the overlap of instructional and faculty development and scholarly work
- *organizational development* emphasizing on an institution's structure and the relationship among its units

In the context of Macau, in this 21st century, the external environment for UM has become more demanding; namely, we as faculty members must become more accountable in facilitating student learning, creating new knowledge, and linking research and practices in ways that benefit societies, local and beyond. It is understood that the quality of faculty relates directly to the effectiveness of our institution's addressing and balancing multiple missions: knowledge dissemination through teaching, knowledge production through research, and knowledge application through services and outreach projects that link institutional expertise with community, society, and even global problems. As members of the UM family, we are obliged to collaborate with our institution to address key questions that should be of interest to the collegiate community, for example:

- What enhances the ability of our university to recruit and retain highly capable faculty members?
- What are the essential elements of academic work and workplaces that will help ensure faculty to find their work satisfying and meaningful so as to enable them to fully use their talents and skills throughout their entire careers?
- How can our university fully recognize and build on the intellectual capital that our faculty represents, and on the talents and abilities of each member of the faculty?

It is my belief that the answer lies in strategic faculty development – the innovative and the caring style. It is a key strategic lever for ensuring institutional quality and supporting institutional change. Namely, developing and maintaining the expertise, commitment, energy, and creativity of our faculty members, directly shapes the experiences of students, the nature of research, and the impact of the institution on the broader community. In this light, it is important to provide an overall framework that outlines the fundamental elements of the work experience of all faculty members, regardless of the nature of their appointments. For example, the *Professional and Organizational Development Network* in Higher Education (POD Network; <http://www.podnetwork.org>), founded in 1974 in the US, in response to the need expressed by faculty members, administrators, and others working in faculty, instructional and organizational development in higher education for a source of professional information and support, provides the following framework in its mission statement for our reference:

1. *Faculty development* encompasses activities that focus on individual faculty members first as teachers engaged in fostering student development. A second theme focuses on faculty members as scholars and professionals and involves such tasks as career planning and development of various scholarly skills. A third area addresses faculty members as persons, and involves activities that enhance a person's well-being such as wellness management, interpersonal skills, stress and time management, and assertiveness training.
2. *Instructional development* strives to enhance individual faculty members' (and their institutions') effectiveness by focusing on courses, the curriculum, and student learning. Instructors serve as members of a design or redesign team, working with instructional design and evaluation specialists, to identify course or curriculum strategies or processes appropriate to achieving stated outcome goals.
3. *Organizational development* focuses on the organizational structure and processes of an institution and its subunits. It seeks to help the organization function in an effective and efficient way to support the work of teachers and students. Leadership training for department chairpersons; effective use of group processes; review, revision, and active use of the mission statement; implementing organizational change processes; and institutional governance are representative topics that fall within the purview of organizational development.

My Current Service Agenda

I am grateful that General Education (GE), as an embodiment of liberal education, is now an official component of the education model at the University of Macau (UM). According to AAC&U (http://www.aacu.org/about/statements/liberal_learning.cfm), a truly liberal education is one that prepares us to live responsible, productive, and creative lives in a dramatically changing world. It is an education that fosters a well-grounded intellectual resilience, a disposition toward lifelong learning, and an acceptance of responsibility for the ethical consequences of our ideas and actions. Essentially, GE requires of us to understand the foundations of knowledge and inquiry about nature, culture, and society; to master core skills of perception, analysis, and expression; to cultivate a respect for truth; to recognize the importance of historical and cultural context; to explore connections among formal learning, citizenship, and service to our communities. As a learner and an instructor myself, I will my students to experience the benefits of general education by pursuing intellectual work that is honest, challenging, and significant, and by preparing themselves to use knowledge and power in responsible ways. Among the numerous areas of my academic services I am committed to render to our collegiate community, include the following:

Inquiry-Based Learning

In the educational context, inquiry-based learning (or enquiry-based learning) (Hepworth & Walton, 2009) has been recognized as a powerful tool for learning about a subject domain, and more importantly for learning how to learn, as it helps people to develop their independent learning skills. Hutchings (2007, p.13) asserted the following:

In inquiry-based learning, the learning is self-directed because it is driven by students' own decisions about appropriate ways in which an issue or scenario might be approached. They bring to bear on the topic any existing knowledge or experience relevant to the issues.

No person comes to the table with no knowledge, and the examination and pooling of what is already known allow students to gain confidence, as well as to practice the habit of reflection. They carry out research and investigations into areas that they decide are essential for a proper response to the issue.

Thus, they discover how to research by engaging in practical examples. In this way, it may be said that the process of enquiry is in the ownership of the students, so that enquiry-based learning is fundamentally concerned with establishing the context, the space, and the environment within which enquiry may best be stimulated and students can take charge of their learning.

The process is student-centered, with the onus always on the students to take initiatives, propose routes of enquiry and follow them thoughtfully. By these means, students also acquire experience in a range of intellectual and social capabilities. These include critical thinking, reflection and self-criticism, teamwork, independence, autonomous thinking and information literacy.

Outcomes-Based Assessment

The idea behind the context of outcomes-based assessment (Driscoll & Wood, 2007) is the fundamental question, “What did the student learn?” It is closely related to the growing concerns about the quality of higher education. It is about building shared responsibility for student learning (Conzemius & O’Neill, 2001) through some collaborative analysis of student works (Boud & Falchikov, 2007). It requires that faculty come together to determine what curricular and course outcomes should be. It is important that teachers and students are part of an educational system in which each part affects the behaviors and properties of the whole. When teachers and students come together to contemplate their collective input – something that had previously most been taken for granted, carried out privately by individual instructors, and seen little reason to improve, increasingly more faculty members have realized that much college teaching could have been improved by decades of research on human learning (Suskie, 2009; Maki, 2010). In particular, we are aware today that students learn more if we set high expectations for them; engage them actively in their learning; provide opportunities for them to interact in connection with their work, with faculty, and with other students; and assess their progress often, providing timely feedback.

Blended Learning Model

The basic principle of blended learning is that face-to-face oral communication and online written communication are optimally integrated such that the strengths of each are blended into a unique learning experience congruent with the context and intended educational purpose (Garrison & Vaughan, 2008). It provides a vision and a roadmap for higher education faculty to understand the possibilities of an engaging and meaningful learning experience (Sharpe, Benfield, Roberts, & Francis, 2006). The key assumptions of a blended learning design include (Garrison & Anderson, 2011; Garrison & Archer, 2007): thoughtfully integrating face-to-face and online learning; fundamentally rethinking the course design to optimize student engagement; and restructuring and replacing traditional class contact hours. This opens a wide range of possibilities for redesign that goes beyond enhancing the traditional classroom lecture; however, it must be based on a sound understanding of higher-order learning environments, communication characteristics, requirements of various disciplines, and related resources (Garrison, 2003, 2004, & 2006).

Learning e-Portfolios

The use of portfolios for teaching and documenting student work has been around for a long time in a number of fields (Stefani, Mason, & Pegler, 2007), including portfolios in both composition and creative writing, in the visual arts, and in architecture and interior design. In the context of college education, learning portfolios are those assembled by students for individual courses. They document and reflect upon the ways in which the students have met the outcomes for particular courses. Instructor’s endorsement is often required to authenticate the course learning portfolios from students. Program learning portfolios are developed by students to document the work they have completed, the skills they have learned, and the outcomes they have accomplished in an academic department or program. The mentor or appraiser could add comments as feedback. It could be a requirement for graduation. Besides, students might use a selection from their

program learning portfolios to show to prospective employers, as important steps of career planning (Lorenzo & Ittelson, 2005).

Despite being effective as mechanisms for showcasing student work, the traditional paper-based portfolios were not easily shared among audiences geographically distributed, and were not easily modified for different purposes and for diverse audiences. With the advent of the Internet starting in the 1990s, we have witnessed the opportunity to experiment with the concept of electronic learning portfolios (e-Portfolios) (Penny Light, Chen, & Ittelson, 2012; Jafari & Kaufman, 2006; Cambridge, 2001). Still, whatever the major focus of engagement with students, the use of e-Portfolios inevitably adds a strong online element to the teaching and learning activities.

In particular, institutions of higher education need to provide electronic support and services; teachers need access and skills to integrate the e-Portfolio application into their overall course design, and students need a wide range of electronic abilities in order to develop their e-Portfolios. The underlying pedagogy of e-Portfolio use is considered an important link with e-learning, too. It is believed that the use of inquiry-based learning should prove promising in the final analysis.

Continuous Improvement in General Education

It is convinced that general education is not confined to particular fields of study. What matters includes substantial content, rigorous methodology and an active engagement with the societal, ethical, and practical implications of our student learning. The spirit and value of general education are equally relevant to all forms of higher education and to all students. By its nature, it is global and pluralistic. It embraces the diversity of ideas and experiences that characterize the social, natural, and intellectual world. To acknowledge such diversity in all its forms is both an intellectual commitment and a social responsibility, for nothing less will equip us to understand our world and to pursue fruitful lives. It is my belief that the ability to think, to learn, and to express oneself both rigorously and creatively, the capacity to understand ideas and issues in context, the commitment to live in society, and the yearning for truth are fundamental features of our humanity. In centering education upon these qualities, general education is the best investment in our shared future.

My Earlier Service Positions

1. Member of the NCP (New Campus Project) Task Force in Faculty Buildings and Learning Facilities - I joined this Task Force at the invitation of Professor Simon SM Ho, Vice Rector (Academic Affairs). My responsibility is to work with the team in peculiar collaboration with two other professors: Professor Rik Carl D'Amato, Director of our Center for Teaching and Learning Enhancement (CTLE), and Professor George CW Cheng, the former interim Dean of FED, Faculty of Education. Our specific charge is to look into the specifics of our NCP Learning Commons, from the perspective of learning space design, and to communicate our NCP needs to an external architectural consultant, AD+RG (whose services ended December-2010), and to provide feedback to our NCP Task Force concerning any latest input from our Government-designated architect in mainland China, upon receipt of their architectural plans (specific layouts).

2. Member of the Informal Working Group (IWG) in A3-BLDG (now the Research and Development Building) regarding Prototype of Learning Commons and Classrooms of the Future - I joined (or rather initiated) this IWG at the request of Professor Simon Ho, our VRAA in January 2010, to investigate how best to experiment with the use of limited space to demonstrate some practical ideas of learning commons, and classrooms of the future, before the official launch of our General Education program in Fall of 2011. Most of the design ideas have been completed by December of 2010, except for fine-grained details in interior design and some equipment implementation, to be followed up by our Center for Teaching and Learning Enhancement (CTLE) starting from right after the A3-BLDG was to be released to UM from the building contractor.

3. Member of the Library Focus Group on the Improvement of User Services - I joined this Focus Group at the invitation of Dr. Helen Jeong formerly from the team of UM Library Circulation Services in 2010. My major responsibility is to render user perspectives on how best our Library services could be improved or upgraded in the immediate future. My input included among other things, adding appropriate smart services in the Library Web, and enhancing the inter-library loan services, as well as shortening the period to acquire reference titles given sufficient budget is available.

4. CTLE Coordinator of E-Learning and Educational Technology (ended 2010DEC31) - I have been helping the development of CTLE since its inception as a volunteer in IT support and later in its macro-plan to provide e-learning services to the University of Macau community. I was thrilled by Professor Rik D'Amato when he invited me to take up this position to have my efforts properly recognized by our senior management in early 2010. My appointment was confirmed by a formal approval from Professor Simon SM Ho, our VRAA, issued in the May-2010. My subsequent responsibilities included, among other things, scenario planning and implementation of CTLE's immediate services in providing wikis and blogs for faculty members in support of CTLE's initiatives in enhancing teaching, learning, and assessment activities. The other charge from Professor Ho then, is to implement some prototype to support outcomes-based assessment (OBA) to line up with the educational reform in undergraduate program delivery through OBTL (outcomes-based teaching and learning). My role is to investigate how our current e-learning platform (UMMoodle) could handle the OBTL requirements, compared to other environment such as the Sakai CLE/OAE, especially in relation to the e-portfolio services in support of an evidence-based approach to stage our elite education initiative at UM.

5. Member of the Information and Educational Technology Committee (IETC) (ended 2010DEC31) - I joined this Standing Committee on behalf of CTLE during my service there as the Coordinator of E-Learning and Educational Technology. My role as commissioned by the Director of CTLE, is to put forth the technological concerns of teaching and learning in the current and future classrooms of the University. Currently, there is no support for lecture capture system installed to help video-record lecture performance for an important part of teaching evaluation to facilitate peer review of teacher performance. There is also no internal video-on-demand services to support instructor's initiative to upload important lessons video-taped for student reviews at their

own convenience, such as from UMMoodle. Yet, such services are increasingly made available around the globe, even in some secondary schools in Macau and Hong Kong.

6. Member of Departmental Committees in Computer & Information Science (CIS) - I joined two committees (General Education + Program Accreditation) at the request of Professor GONG Zhiguo, Head of CIS Department in early 2011. My role in the General Education Committee is to explore educational practices that could best match the General Education goals and requirements, and that in the Program Accreditation Committee is to provide my perspectives and concrete ideas in completing the various details expected in the final draft report submitted to HKIE (Hong Kong Institution of Engineers) to apply for program accreditation for our newly revised CIS undergraduate program in Computer Science. Our next goal after obtaining the HKIE accreditation is to proceed to apply for accreditation from ABET (Accreditation Bureau for Engineering and Technology) based in the US.

7. Member of IEEE Computer Society's Technical Council on Software Engineering - I joined this Council with an intention to continue collective efforts to make "Software Engineering" a respectable discipline. Besides reviewing the SE2004 Undergraduate Curriculum (<http://sites.computer.org/ccse/SE2004Volume.pdf>), there is an ongoing effort since 2009 to review the Graduate Professional Software Engineering program (GSWE2009) (<http://www.gswe2009.org/>).

8. Associate Editor, Journal of Information Technology Education (ISSN: 1539-3585) (<http://jite.org>), Informing Science Institute, USA. - I have been performing my editorial work in this journal since 2005. I have learned a lot from my participation as an editor, helping peers around the world to produce quality publications in the area of information technology (IT) education. I enjoy this role very much being able to keep in touch with what is going on in the field of IT education, and to bring the same knowledge to help improve my teaching and research at the University of Macau.

9. Member of the Editorial Advisory Board of the following publications - I enjoy the learning acquired from collaborating with colleagues from other academic circles around the world in producing quality publications in the fields related to information and communications technologies in higher education, governments and businesses:

- Campus Wide Information Systems: The International Journal of Information and Learning Technology (ISSN 1065-0741) (<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/cwis.htm>), published by Emerald, England (2004-2006).
- Handbook of Research on E-Government Readiness for Information and Service Exchange: Utilizing Progressive Information Communication Technologies (ISBN 978-1-60566-671-6) (<http://www.igi-global.com/reference/details.asp?id=34559>), edited by Hakikur Rahman, and published by Information Science Reference (Hershey, PA, USA) in 2009.
- Cases on Adoption, Diffusion and Evaluation of Global E-Governance Systems: Impact at the Grass Roots (ISBN 978-1-61692-814-8) (<http://www.igi->

global.com/Bookstore/TitleDetails.aspx?TitleId=41738), edited by Hakikur Rahman, published by IGI Global Inc. (Hershey, PA, USA) in 2010.

- Cases on SMEs and Open Innovation: Applications and Investigations (ISBN 978-1-61350-314-0)(<http://www.igi-global.com/bookstore/titledetails.aspx?titleid=53000>), edited by Hakikur Rahman and Isabel Ramos, published by IGI Global Inc. (Hershey, PA, USA) in 2011.

10. Member of Editorial Review Boards for the following international journals published by the US-based Information Resources Management Association (IRMA), Informing Science Institute (ISI), Association of Information Technology Professionals (AITP), Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD), VirginiaTech, and IPCA – Polytechnic Institute of Cávado and Ave, Portugal - I enjoy the opportunities to serve in the editorial boards for such journals, which have continuously brought in fresh insight in my own research and teaching at the University of Macau:

- International Journal of E-Adoption (ISSN 1937-9633) (<http://www.igi-global.com/journals/details.asp?ID=7767>), published by IRMA;
- Informing Science: The International Journal of an Emerging Discipline (ISSN 1521-4672) (<http://inform.nu>), published by ISI;
- Journal of Information, Information Technology and Organization (ISSN 1557-1335) (<http://jiito.org>), published by ISI;
- Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge and Management (ISSN 1555-1237) (<http://ijikm.org>), published by ISI;
- International Journal of Doctoral Studies (IJDS) (ISSN 1556-8873) (<http://www.ijds.org/>), published by ISI;
- Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects (IJELLO) (ISSN 1552-2237) (<http://www.ijello.org/>), published by ISI;
- Information and Communication Technologies for the Advanced Enterprise: An International Journal (ISSN 1647-1407) (<http://www.ict4ae.org>), published by IPCA.
- International Journal of ePortfolio (IJeP ISSN 2157-622X) (<http://www.theijep.com/about.html>) published by the Center for Instructional Development and Educational Research in the Office of Undergraduate Education at VirginiaTech
- Journal of Information Systems Education (JISE ISSN 1055-3096) (<http://jise.org/index.htm>), published by the Education Special Interest Group (EDSIG) of the Association of Information Technology Professionals (AITP)
- *To Improve the Academy (TIA): Resources for Faculty, Instructional, and Organizational Development*, Volume 31, edited by James E. Groccia, published by POD (2012) (<http://www.podnetwork.org/publications/academy.htm>)

11. Member of the Review Community for the following international conferences:

- The Annual (39th, 40th, 41st, 42nd, and 43rd) ACM Technical Symposium for Computer Science Education (SIGCSE2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012);

- The Annual (11th, 14th, 17th) ACM Conference on Innovation and Technology in Computer Science Education (ITiCSE 2006, 2009, 2012);
- The Annual (4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th) Conference of the Southern Association for Information Systems (SAIS 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006);
- The Information Systems Education Conference (ISECON 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005);
- The Informing Science + IT Education Conference (InSITE 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2012);
- The Sixth Australasian Computing Education Conference (ACE2004);
- The 2004 International Conference on Computing, Communications and Control Technologies (CCCT2004)

12. Volunteer Mentor for the following initiatives at the University of Macau - I have been a mentor for first-year students for years. I enjoy the privilege to become mentor to first-year students when they need the most the help to transition themselves from the secondary school mentality of learning to the mode of autonomy affiliated so much with college education. In retrospect, I was (or had been) the mentor to the University of Macau Christian Fellowship (UMCF) from 1992 to 2000, when the concept of mentorship was not well known at UM. This is indeed the 30th Anniversary for this UMCF student organization. It was formed in 1981 when the University of East Asia (the former University of Macau) was established. I was there as a student participant from the local Yuet Wah College then. Time flies. I finished high school in 1983, my college education in 1988, my Master education in 1990, and my PhD education in 2011.

13. Co-Founders of the following two government-registered (non-profit-making) community organizations in Macau as ministries to serve Macau's youth (continuation of my early mentorship efforts at UM):

- *Macau Christian Literature Association* (since 1994) - This organization publishes the now monthly Christian Newspaper (Macau Times); formerly, we published in a bimonthly fashion, delivering 8000 to 10000 free issues each time, requiring a respective sponsoring budget of from MOP5000.00 in 1994, to about MOP1,5000.00 in 2010. I left this organization in 2000, with a heart of thanksgiving that it could go on its own with the support of different churches in Macau, and with a team of dedicated staff. My service there was done on a volunteer basis without incurring any monetary compensation.
- *Macau Fellowship of Christian Students* (Macau FCS) (since 2007) - This organization provides learning-in-communities services to both undergraduates studying at different higher education institutions in Macau, and graduates from both local higher education institutions and those outside Macau. It is formed under the Christian belief of leadership that there is always a leader in each of us that we need to develop and to get ready for the mission in life once our personal vision has been made clear from our life calling. It is an organization run from the donations from different individuals with a similar heart to serve, and it has the support of different local churches. My role there was to bridge the different

generations of students from the early 1990s to the recent 2000s and beyond. I shed all my positions in this organization in 2009, with a heart of thanksgiving that it could well be operated by a team of dedicated and mature Christians, many of whom are our University of Macau graduates. My service there was done on a volunteer basis without incurring any monetary compensation.

My Personal Growth Plan

No doubt I need to grow in my service to the University. And the best way to achieve professional growth is to continue my role as a reflective practitioner, performing practitioner research along the path of my services. One suitable form of such research is action research done in a collaborative manner, which is also referred to as *collegial inquiry* by Cunningham (2011), considered as a learner-centered approach to staff development. It emphasizes the idea that individual and teams of educators can and should study their practice as a means to improve it (Mills, 2007). As a practical professional development approach, collegial inquiry requires educators in a professional learning community to make decisions about what to study and how to study and to commit to reflective practice. Collegial inquiry is a disciplined, recursive approach to professional learning with a cycle of behaviors that involves establishing a focus; generating questions; taking action; collecting and analyzing data; reflecting; adjusting course; and, often, generating new questions to pursue. This reflexive process supports learning and improved practice, and it comprises three stages:

- *Planning* begins with establishing a focus, generating research questions, and envisioning success;
- *Implementation* includes taking action, collecting and analyzing data, reading professional literature, and discussion;
- *Analysis and reflection* often lead a group to cycle back to planning and implementation.

It is my understanding that collegial inquiry fosters the development of important dispositions that support professional learning communities and contribute to leadership capacity. Educators engaged in collegial inquiry are expected of cultivating the following characteristics (Martin-Kniep, 2007) that should improve the culture of the learning organization and contribute to sustainable growth:

- Work for deep understanding
- Develop intellectual perseverance
- Commit to reflective practice
- Build a commitment to collaborative and collegial work
- Recognize and honor others' expertise, and
- Be courageous to speak their minds

Indeed, the process of collegial inquiry requires us educators involved to be committed to building a deep understanding of an issue, problem, or practice by virtue of multiple perspectives. The process also requires intellectual perseverance because it takes time to

learn deeply and ensure legitimate understanding before taking action. Meanwhile, educators engaged in the inquiry process are obliged to reflect on their understanding and practice as individuals and in groups. We collect and analyze data to make informed and sound decisions, and we engage in individual and collective goal setting and monitoring. Consequently, collegial inquiry requires educators to share their thinking, question together, make decisions, and consider one another's perspectives on teaching and learning. Over time, these members learn to support, respect, and listen to their peers. The various perspectives we bring to bear serve to deepen understanding and improve quality. Eventually, collegial inquiry should empower individuals and groups to honor and make commitments to developing expertise and can foster courage and initiative among the members of a learning community. Since the inquiry process is meant to be learner-centered, it should foster true ownership of learning among us educators.

My Perceived Significance of a Sustainable Service Commitment

As a response to the complexity of the everyday teaching and learning situations encountered as a member of an institution of higher education in Macau, and at the advent of the expanding Internet technologies, it is my intention to set out to see if different ideas from the study of instructional design with educational technologies in the context of institutional transformation, and knowledge (pedagogical) management, could help to find ways of understanding and dealing with the difficulties of taking action, both individually and in groups, to improve the situation which is created continuously and changed continually by our daily experiences. Specifically, my continual inquiry should explore the value of the bundle of ideas captured in the notion of the learning organization (university as a learning enterprise), which is investigated as a way to enable knowledge synthesis among a group of people working to achieve a common goal or a set of goals. This could be explored through the development of transformation scenarios in the midst of an organization's transition from the mechanistic command-and-control model to the organic leadership-and-collaboration model.

Yet, in order to document the learning enterprise's transformation from its bricks-and-mortar entity to its clicks-and-mortar counterpart, any serious investigation must put into perspective the teaching and learning concerns from different communities of inquiry in the university environment, with the ultimate end of providing learning organization inspirational support to course stakeholders embracing the philosophy of learner-centered education (LCE) and the practice of blended learning. In particular, specific cases of electronic course support, developed through scenario-based design, applicable to the LCE style of teaching should be of immediate interest, as an illustration of how the individual electronic services of a rich environment for active learning (REAL) space could be conceived and established at the university.

Indeed, the nature of my professional service should move away from working with the idea of an obvious problem, which required solution, to that of working with the idea of a situation of concerns, which some people, for various reasons, may regard as 'in need of solution.' In the specific context of how to enliven the learning university, the problem situation must also be investigated from such dimensions as the social, the cultural and the political. Some relevant purposeful activity models should then be discussed which

account for the context of human activity systems conceived as a vehicle to do organizational modeling and analysis. Also of interest is the elaboration of the changes that would improve the situation, and the accommodations between conflicting interests, which will enable actions-to-improve to be taken.

New information and communication technologies (ICTs), and above all the World Wide Web, hold out many promises for higher education institutions in terms of flexibility, efficiency, quality and access. The vision is that of a learning university with enough virtualization to support its quality knowledge activities. This collegial inquiry should seek to uncover what the pursuit of that vision, from the perspective of a learning-centered organization, means for a higher education institution, in terms of knowledge development and transfer, through the efforts of hopefully different dedicated teacher-researchers acting as instructional designers, as organizational architects, and as servant-leaders. Therefore, among my perceived contributions of a sustainable service commitment include the following:

- Specific organizational learning to be accrued and shared among institutions of higher education, especially in Macau, in the context of documenting student learning particularly through the use of e-Portfolios;
- Pinpointed case studies of how student learning can be produced and enhanced through different pedagogical and technological designs that are enacted in a blended learning environment, characterized by the use of course or learning management systems;
- Extended understanding and interpretation of the nature of individual and collective participation in inquiry-based learning directed at growth and development in academic (teaching and learning) endeavors in pursuit of excellence (personal or collaborative knowledge creation);
- Close examination of the contextual dynamics (social, cultural, and political analysis) within which technology-enhanced learning in the specific institution of higher education takes place, and how best to respond to and improve the situation of concerns (e.g., culture and learning, educational reform, policy re-orientation).

Finally, but not the least, it is my goal to be able to see to the development and realization of the following system of relevance and excellence:

**A university-own system,
operated by skilled professionals,
which, under the learning-centered initiative of college education,
develops and maintains a virtual space of learning,
called *UM REALSpace*, for students, teachers, and administrators,
developed through collaborative and participatory approach,
in order to contribute to meaningful student learning
in relation to curriculum/learning development, and
the learning-teaching-assessing (LTA) processes
of college education**

References

- Barkley, E.F. (2010). *Student engagement techniques: A handbook for college faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Benfield, G. & Roberts, G. (2008). *Blended e-Learning in HE. Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development*. (PDF PPT). Available at: https://mw.brookes.ac.uk/download/attachments/6160945/Blended_eLearning+%28handouts%29.pdf?version=1
- Boud, D., & Falchikov, N. (2007). *Rethinking assessment in higher education*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Braskamp, L.A., Trautvetter, L.C., & Ward, K. (2006). *Putting students first: How colleges develop students purposefully*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bresciani, M.J. (2006). *Implementing outcomes-based assessment of student learning*. PPT (PowerPoint Presentation) available at: http://interwork.sdsu.edu/elip/consultation/presentations/implement_assmt_stu_learning.pdf
- Cambridge, B.L. (2001). *Electronic portfolios: Emerging practices in student, faculty, and institutional learning*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Cambridge, D. (2010). *Eportfolios for lifelong learning and assessment*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cambridge, D., Cambridge B., & Yancey, K. (2009). *Electronic portfolios 2.0: Emergent research on implementation and impact*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Carter, M. (2003). A process for establishing outcomes-based assessment plans for writing and speaking in the disciplines. *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, 6(1). Available at: <http://wac.colostate.edu/llad/v6n1/carter.pdf>
- Chen, H.L., & Penny Light, T. (2010). *Electronic portfolios and student success: Effectiveness, efficiency, and learning*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities.
- Conzemius, A., & O'Neill, J. (2001). *Building shared responsibility for student learning*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Cooperrider, D. (1986). *Appreciative inquiry: Toward a methodology for understanding and enhancing organizational innovation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Cooperrider, D.L., & Srivastva, S. (1987). Appreciative inquiry in organizational life. In W. Pasmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organization change and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 129-169). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Cunningham, D. (2011). *Improving teaching with collaborative action research*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- De Bono, E. (1999). *New thinking for the new millennium*. London, England: Penguin Books.
- Doyle, T. (2008). *Helping students learn in a learner-centered environment: A guide to facilitating learning in higher education*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Doyle, T. (2011). *Learner-centered teaching: Putting the research on learning into practice*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

- Driscoll, A., & Wood, S. (2007). *Developing outcomes-based assessment for learner-centered education: A faculty introduction*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Gannod, G.G. (2009). *Outcomes-based assessment process*. PPT (PowerPoint Presentation) available at: http://www.units.muohio.edu/celt/assessment/student_success/CSA_Powerpoint.pdf.
- Gappa, J.M., Austin, A.E., & Trice, A.G. (2007). *Rethinking faculty work: Higher education's strategic imperative*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Garrison, D. (2003). Cognitive presence for effective asynchronous online learning: The role of reflective inquiry, self-direction and meta-cognition. In J. Bourne & J.C. Moore (Eds.), *Elements of quality online education: Practice and direction* (pp. 29-38). Volume 4 in the Sloan C Series, Needham, MA: The Sloan Consortium.
- Garrison, D. (2004). Transformative leadership and e-learning. In K. Matheos & T. Carey (Eds.), *Advances and challenges in eLearning at Canadian research universities* (pp.46-54). *CHERD Occasional Papers in Higher Education*, 12, University of Manitoba.
- Garrison, D. (2006). *Online community of inquiry review: Understanding social, cognitive and teaching presence*. Invited paper presented to the Sloan Consortium Asynchronous Learning Network Invitational Workshop, Baltimore, MD, August.
- Garrison, D., & Anderson, T. (2011). *E-Learning in the 21st century: A framework for research and practice, 2e*. London, UK: Routledge/Falmer.
- Garrison, D., & Archer, W. (2007). A community of inquiry framework for online learning. In M. Moore (ed.), *Handbook of distance education*. New York, NY: Erlbaum.
- Garrison, D., & Vaughan, N. (2008). *Blended learning in higher education: Frameworks, principles, and guidelines*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Greenleaf, R.K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hartley, P., Hilsdon, J., Keenan, C., Sinfield, S, & Verity, M. (2011). *Universities into the 21st century: Learning development in higher education*. London, England: Palgrave (Macmillan).
- Healey, M. (2009). *Active learning and learning styles: A selected bibliography*. Centre for Active Learning (CeAL), UK. Available at: <http://resources.glos.ac.uk/shareddata/dms/7A5EC57BBCD42A039B4046B28A1917D6.pdf>
- Hepworth, M. & Walton, G. (2009). *Teaching information literacy for inquiry-based learning*. Oxford, England: Chandos Publishing.
- Huba, M.E., & Freed, J.E. (2000). *Learner-centered assessment on college campuses: Shifting the focus from teaching to learning*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Hutchings, W. (2007). *Enquiry-based learning: definitions and rationale*. Manchester: Centre for Excellence in Enquiry-Based Learning.
- Jafari, A. & Kaufman, C. (2006). *Handbook of research on ePortfolios*. Hershey: Idea Group Reference.
- Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Schuh, J.H., Whitt, E.J., & Associates. (2005). *Student success in college: Creating conditions that matter*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lethbridge, T., & Laganriere, R. (2005). *Object-oriented software engineering, 2e*. New York: McGraw-Hill International.

- Light, G., Cox, R., & Calkins, S. (2009). *Learning and teaching in higher education: The reflective professional*, 2e. London, England: Sage.
- Littlejohn, A., & Pegler, Chris (2007). *Preparing for blended e-Learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Lorenzen, M. (2004). *Using outcome-based education in the planning and teaching of new information technologies*. Available at: <http://www.libraryinstruction.com/obe.html>.
- Lorenzo, G., & Ittelson, J. (2005). An overview of institutional e-portfolios. In D. Oblinger (Ed.), *Educause learning initiative*. Available online at: <http://www.educause.edu/ir/library/pdf/ELI3002.pdf> (last accessed May 10, 2008)
- Maki, P. (2010). *Assessing for learning: Building a sustainable commitment across the institution*, 2e. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Martin-Kniep, G.O. (2007). *Communities that learn, lead, and last: Building and sustaining educational expertise*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B., & Caffarella, R.S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide*, 2e. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mills, G.E. (2007). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*, 3e. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Milne, A.J. (2007). *Entering the interaction age: Implementing a future vision for campus learning spaces*. EDUCAUSE, Jan/Feb, pp.13-31.
- Milton, N.R. (2007). *Knowledge acquisition in practice: A step-by-step guide*. New York: Springer.
- Penny Light, T., Chen, H., & Ittelson, J. (2012). *Documenting learning with ePortfolios: A guide for college instructors*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Ramsden, P. (2005). *Learning to teach in higher education*, 2e. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Richardson, V. (Ed.). (2001). *Handbook of research on teaching*, 4e. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Senge, P. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. London, U.K.: Currency Doubleday.
- Sharpe, R., Benfield, G., Roberts, G. & Francis, R. (2006). The undergraduate experience of blended e-learning: A review of UK literature and practice. *Higher Education Academy*. Available at: http://hca.ltsn.ac.uk/assets/documents/research/literature_reviews/blended_elearning_exec_summary_1.pdf
- Stefani, L., Mason R., & Pegler, C. (2007). *The educational potential of e-portfolios: Supporting personal development and reflective learning*. New York: Routledge.
- Suskie, L. (2009). *Assessing student learning: A common sense guide*, 2e. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Thatchenkery, T., & Chowdhry, D. (2007). *Appreciative inquiry and knowledge management*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Wilcox, S. (1997). *Learning from our past: The history of educational development in Canadian Universities*. Centre for Higher Education Research and Development. Eric# ED443309.
- Zubizarreta, J. (2009). *The learning portfolio: Reflective practice for improving student learning*, 2e. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.