AALL
Association for Academic
Language and Learning

Lost in (open learning) space

Jane L. Kehrwald, Michael Head and Rowena Harper

Learning and Teaching Unit, University of South Australia, Adelaide SA 5000, Australia

Email: Jane.Kehrwald@unisa.edu.au, Michael.Head@unisa.edu.au and Rowena.Harper@unisa.edu.au

The shift in focus by higher education providers to more student-centred approaches to teaching and learning has necessitated a rethinking of learning spaces to better support such approaches. Places of learning have shifted from traditional, physical classroom or lecture spaces to virtual spaces, and increasingly to discipline and non-discipline specific learning commons or hubs. In early 2013, the University of South Australia (UniSA) launched a new open learning space (OLS) at its Mawson Lakes campus. The Language, Literacies & Learning (L3) team were tasked with utilising the OLS for the provision of academic language and learning (ALL) support to students. Drawing on institutional data, staff and student feedback, and literature on current practice in OLS from other tertiary institutions, this paper reflects critically on the principles and processes which underpinned the conceptualisation of the ALL support role within the OLS. It reveals a number of tensions between ALL practice, the L3 model and the University's evolving conceptualization of the OLS: for example, private and personalised support in a public forum, flexibility in service delivery, space "ownership" and identity, and purpose of the space. Addressing these tensions has implications, not only for the model of ALL service provision at the Mawson Lakes campus, but also, on a much larger scale, for the new Learning Centre scheduled to be opened at the City West campus in early 2014.

Key Words: academic literacy; learning spaces; language and learning support

1. Introduction

In July 2010, the University of South Australia (UniSA) announced the development of a new $95 million Learning Centre at its City West campus. This reflected a similar trend across Australian tertiary institutions who have planned or launched new buildings with a similar learning and technology focus. Designed to "improve student learning experiences and services" (UniSA, 2010), the Learning Centre will bring together a range of student and staff spaces – formal/informal, academic/social, collaborative/private – to provide a more "integrated" approach to supporting student learning (UniSA, 2011). As well as catering for more than 15,000 students, the Learning Centre will bring together staff from the Learning and Teaching Unit (LTU) – including staff from the academic language and learning team – the University Library, Campus Central, Information Strategy and Technology Services, and Security in what has become known as a "shared services model". Unlike a traditional shared services model in which teams are structurally merged to reduce the overheads associated with mulitple services, this model will not merge teams from across the institution; rather, it will create a single contact point or "delivery point" to enable students to more readily access the various services offered by the University.

At the same time, another major initiative got underway. An English Language Advisory Group was established to re-draft UniSA's English Language implementation model, central to which was a proposed restructure and re-orientation of the language and learning team. The result was a model of provision designed to deal more directly with the issue of English language proficiency (ELP) than had previously been the case. The team was brought together under a new name, L3: Language, Literacies and Learning, and their work was reorganised according to a new English language model (see Murray, 2010) which aimed to "ensure that those students at risk due to lack of English proficiency have access to more systematic, appropriate and sustainable language development mechanisms" (Wright, 2011, p. 3). Although the model defines ELP broadly (as encompassing general English language proficiency, academic literacies and professional communication skills) and is expressly aimed at *all* students regardless of language background, it nevertheless aims to tightly manage and ration the finite resources of the L3 team via a controlled system:

- academic literacies and professional communication skills are to be embedded in the curriculum for all students by L3 teams that are Division-aligned;
- a suite of online resources and workshop series will support the development of language, literacies and learning for all students;
- one initial 1:1 consultation will be available for all students;
- the English Language Self-Assessment Tool (ELSAT) can be taken at any time by any student, and then
- those completing ELSAT who achieve an eligible result will be able to access eight 1:1 consultations and language feedback on two marked pieces of assessment.

The rationale is that the expensive resource of 1:1 consultations should be provided only for students who are most in need of English language development, while the other elements of proficiency more applicable to all students should be dealt with in ways that are more widely accessible.

A fundamental tension arises from factors underpinning the conceptualisation of language and learning work at UniSA, however. In the vision for the new Learning Centre, the L3 team is constructed as one of the services for which an important quality measure is likely to be "access": the more students who engage with services in the new building, the more successful it will be seen to be. The English language model, however, explicitly resists the idea of access and instead requires the *restriction* of certain services to particular groups of students in order to ensure that key issues such as ELP are being addressed. While the new Learning Centre does not open until January 2014, the L3 team was confronted with this tension earlier than anticipated when construction commenced on a smaller refurbishment at UniSA's Mawson Lakes campus. This project reworked part of the Library to create a new and still unnamed "open learning space" (OLS) that would bring together teams from the LTU – again, including the L3 team, the University Library and Campus Central. The Project Brief for the OLS cites the creation of a shared services model as an explicit goal, so in effect this project was seen as a pilot for the new Learning Centre. The physical space across the Library's ground floor was opened up for a greater range of student uses, with the additional aim of creating greater visibility for the services' new "reception pods" in the hope that this would increase student access. The LTU staff were relocated to another section of the same building which was refubished as a large open plan office accessible to staff only.

While preparing to move their practice out into the OLS, the L3 team not only encountered the fundamental tension outlined above, but also a range of additional tensions that emerged along the way. These related to conceptualisations of student learning behaviours at university, the invisibility of language and learning work in the literature on open spaces, and the philosophies that underpin the very nature of academic language and learning practice. While the L3 team saw potential in the OLS and welcomed the opportunity to think about how they could work with students (and staff) in new ways, they were still acutely aware of having to resolve the tensions of a range of conflicting and competing discourses within which their work is conceptualised. The aim of this paper is to provide an account of and a reflection of the tensions

the team experienced. It brings key themes from the literature on learning spaces together with key themes from ALL to highlight some of the disjunctions and invisibilities that exist for ALL staff working in open spaces. It also draws together staff and student reflections to think through some of the issues that ALL staff are likely to encounter in these types of spaces. The conclusions drawn illustrate the need to critically interrogate the philosophies and assumptions underpinning open learning spaces and carefully consider how open learning spaces are operationalised.

2. Private vs. public

The OLS Project Brief expressed a number of overarching aims that aligned with those of the new Learning Centre, such as improving student engagement and experience with the University's services. Although this provided some explicit (and measureable) goals, it was largely left to teams within the LTU to determine how they might operate in this new and still unnamed open learning space. The only expectation was that the language and learning team begin to conduct its work with students out in the open, and particularly their 1:1 consultations. While other teams in the LTU, such as Disability Services and Counselling, cited confidentiality as a (legitimate) reason for being unable to work in the open with students, this was not perceived to be an issue for the language and learning team, which was instead identified from the outset as one of the teams who could "un-problematically" move their work out into the open. This was in part a necessity, driven by the constraints of the space itself; staff no longer had offices in which to conduct 1:1s. The assumption at the design stage had clearly been that offices were not necessary for the conduct of 1:1s, so meeting rooms had been designed into the new space largely for that purpose. However, their use was discouraged by a range of factors: they had to be booked and shared across seven teams, meaning they were available only at limited times; they were located in the staff area and away from the open student space behind a card-access-only door and through a copy room and kitchen area; and they were white, sterile and windowless, making for an unpleasant environment. So although staff were reluctant to move into the open in the context of a 1:1 consultation, the meeting room alternatives were not sufficiently flexible, nor were they at all inclusive or student friendly.

L3 staff were unsurprisingly very nervous about how open 1:1s would work in practice. Chiefly, they were anxious about the effects an open, multi-use space would have on the quality of 1:1 interactions with students. Firstly, the space is public and quite busy, located next to the entry foyer to the Library, and also next to reception points for Library services, Campus Central and the LTU. Staff predicted that the amount of foot traffic, noise and other distractions in the space would fundamentally change the nature of the 1:1 interactions they had with students – they just weren't sure *how*. Secondly, the space is not only public, but multi-use. Unlike a writing centre, where students congregate with a shared purpose of getting assistance to develop their writing, and unlike a learning commons, where students gather to study, the new space combined a range of functions so that the L3 staff would be conducting 1:1s between a booth that photographed students for their ID cards and a bank of bean bags where students could nap. Consequently, the range of students populating the space would not necessarily be sympathetic to the sub-group of students coming along with language and learning concerns, and staff were very concerned that students may feel self-conscious about that, and stay away.

Moreover, the OLS presented a significant challenge to the kind of "emotion work" (Huyton, 2009) that is fundamental to 1:1 practice. Discussing "emotion work", Mortiboys (2002, as cited in Huyton, 2009, p. 1) argues that in the context of coursework in higher education, "significant personal disclosure in public on the part of students is rarely appropriate", but that in the "private and personalised" contexts of learning support sessions, students are able to work more openly on the kinds of emotional (as well as intellectual) transformations needed to learn successfully. Drawing on Earwaker (1992), Huyton (2009, p.7) suggests that learning support typically encompasses "a form of pedagogy that recognizes and takes account of the effects of personal change on learners", and that the learner's emotions and relationships with us are pivotal to the success of each interaction. This is something about which ALL advisers are acutely aware. When 1:1s are private and personalised, students open up about their own

learning journey in ways they do not in public and in ways that are often critical for helping them develop. They cry, they complain, they confess and admit all manner of things, they question, and they freely express doubt – in themselves and in their own understanding. Acknowledging these emotions, and helping students to manage them, are part of what allows ALL advisers to practice what Rogers (1980, as cited in Huyton 2009, p. 7) calls "unified learning", which simultaneously encompasses "cognitive, experiential and affective" dimensions. There were deep concerns in all of the L3 advisers that this move into the open would close down the possibility to work with students in such a unified way, and that the nature of the interactions would be inherently different.

Admittedly, L3 staff also saw potential benefits in moving into the open, such as making the kind of work they do with individuals more visible. Staff had often expressed the desire to move away from the "medicalised" context within which 1:1s are often couched, in that visiting an ALL adviser is not unlike visiting a doctor: ALL teams frequently operate from a special unit or centre and appointments must be made to gain access; there is a reception desk at the front and a waiting room where the student sits until they are collected by the adviser, and they are then escorted to the adviser's office where they articulate certain "problems" they perceive they are having with their learning. While the practice that occurs within 1:1s may be developmental rather than remedial, the spatial constructs they often operate within do little to combat the perception of ALL units as "fix-it" centres (Craswell & Bartlett, 2002; Stevenson & Kokkinn, 2007). In this pilot, staff at least had the hope that a move into a different kind of space might make ALL work more visible to a broader range of students and thereby construe the act of asking questions about language and learning as a perfectly normal part of learning: developmental rather than remedial. But they were deeply aware, also, that 1:1s in this context then became in part a kind of "performance" of a 1:1 – a public showing in which students' personal learning sessions achieved an additional purpose of presenting ALL practice as "normal".

The solution, staff agreed, was two-fold. Firstly, any student with a pre-booked consultation would be offered a choice about where it would be conducted. As the open space also served as a waiting area for students who were there to see someone from the LTU, advisers agreed that when they left the staff space to collect the student, they would ask whether they wanted to stay where they were, or "go somewhere quieter". It was predicted that students who had seen advisers before and who were familiar with a certain context for 1:1 sessions would tend to choose the meeting room, while students unfamiliar with our work might choose to stay put. Overwhelmingly, however, students chose to remain in the open space. Of course, the L3 advisers questioned whether the choices students were making were entirely informed or empowered choices, and they could not be sure. For example, students may choose to stay in the open because it's quicker. They may perceive that it's easier for the adviser to stay where they are than move back into the staff area they had just left. Moreover, having not seen the "quiet area", new students in particular may be unsure about the alternative being offered, and choose to stick with the familiar space despite its drawbacks. While student feedback, generally, has been positive, an informal survey of students who have used the open space for drop-in consultations indicates that if given the option, approximately 75% would prefer an enclosed setting to discuss their language and learning questions.

Secondly, the L3 team decided to offer regular "drop-in" consultations alongside their other offerings within the English language model. They felt that a degree of "free" access befitted the principles underpinning the new space, and would go towards normalising the work of the L3 team in a manner that also maintained students' sense of control over their engagement with the team. Drop-ins also demonstrated the willingness of the L3 team to embrace one of the important features of open learning spaces: their flexibility. Flexibility in such spaces can relate to time, space, interactions and technology. These learning spaces, many of which are located within campus libraries (such as the one at UniSA's Mawson Lakes campus) or designated information or learning commons, typically have extended opening hours or provide 24-hour key-card only access (Oblinger, 2005). Flexibility also extends to the provision of a mix of space types, such as tables, corrals, private study rooms, computer pools and computer stations

to support multiple modes of learning (Oblinger, 2005). This provides for flexibility in students' interactions as well, allowing students to engage in group discussion and meetings and providing space for experiential learning, reflection and non-curricular activities.

In the case of the L3 team, the flexibility related to who the team were able to see (students didn't require a lecturer referral or ELSAT score), and the topics the team were able to discuss with students; the focus did not need to be solely on ELP. Because students could raise any issue about their academic language and learning, staff had to remain open and flexible. However, the workload constraints of the team were such that they could not offer any other kinds of flexibility. Due to the team's commitments to lecturers and workshop programs, and also due to the competition across multiple teams for use of the OLS, both the drop-in sessions and the booked 1:1 appointments were highly scheduled. A formal, semester-long program for the drop-in sessions was coordinated between the various LTU teams using the OLS, and was then advertised through poster displays and email notices to students at the beginning of the year. This allowed for no flexibility in staff members' calendars, and did not take into account ebbs and flows in the semester in which students were more or less likely to seek out the support of the L3 team. In terms of the location, a fixed area was designated for L3 staff to meet with students after a great deal of consultation with other teams who were operating in the OLS. This space was furnished with a medium sized round table and four chairs – no other furniture was available if staff wanted to adjust the arrangement. If a student seeking advice during a drop-in was working at a computer station, the L3 advisers would often situate themselves with the student if this was more convenient. Therefore, staff had little control over the space in which they found themselves doing all their 1:1 teaching.

3. L3 in open learning spaces: Unexplored territory

To assist them in making the adjustment to this "foreign" new space, the L3 team's first instinct was to consult the literature. It was here that another issue arose when the team discovered there was a lack of literature on learning spaces practice written from an academic language and learning perspective. While the team was aware that many university language and learning teams work out in the open in a range of ways, either through writing centres, library learning commons, or other kinds of open spaces, there was little literature discussing the experiences of the staff who are involved. The bulk of the existing literature discusses two main kinds of learning spaces: either those designed for coursework teaching (workshops, labs and lecture theatres), or those within libraries that have the expressed function of serving as information or learning commons. For the reasons outlined below, L3 staff could not locate themselves within the prevailing discourse.

Firstly, the discussion of coursework spaces tends to assume that traditional teaching spaces create a didactic form of teaching and learning in which students are positioned as empty vessels to be filled with official knowledge held by the teacher as authority. While the team contests this generalisation, the literature seems to assume that the teaching and learning taking place in traditional classrooms is not particularly learner-centred, and that architecture and interior design can play a key role in shifting the student/teacher relationship. Many argue that a major function of new learning spaces should be to carefully manage how the construct of knowledge is projected by the design of that space, particularly with regard to authority and power over knowledge (Bennett, 2006), and that staff working in these spaces need to make an ideological shift away from "claims to authority over knowledge" (Bennett, 2006, p. 20) if the spaces are to be successful.

L3 staff however felt that this ideology already underpinned their entire *raison d'etre* and that of the field of ALL more broadly. Much of the team's practice is predicated on the historical tendency for disciplinary experts to share content knowledge with students as part of their role as teachers, but on the whole fail to induct students into their discipline's literacy practices, which students have instead been expected to pick up indirectly. As a result, students often cannot think and speak in ways that are intelligible for their disciplinary community, and feel like outsiders within their discipline's communities of practice. Secondly, the focus on content

over form is a feature of university curricula that maintains the expert's claim to authority within a discipline. Importantly, it is also a feature which the L3 team work actively to redress by aiming to assist every student to more readily access "the cultures of enquiry in academic disciplines" (AALL, About Us, ¶ 1). This is done by making explicit the literacy practices of these disciplines, which have tended to remain implicit in teaching.

4. Collaborative vs. individual spaces

In addition to coursework spaces, the other kind of learning space that dominates the literature is the learning commons or other open study spaces that students use *outside* their coursework. This part of the literature is typically written from a Library or information literacy perspective and tends to explore two main issues: firstly, how students operate both individually and collaboratively within the spaces by alternately seeking privacy and engagement with other students, and secondly, how students might access technologies and services within the spaces. While these commons spaces are much more similar to the new OLS than coursework spaces, the discourse around learning commons still failed to help the L3 team envisage how they might construct their relationship with students in this new space.

Much of the literature on how students might come to use a learning commons space imagines students' study behaviours both on and off campus occurring either alone in relative isolation (individual study), or occurring with other students (collaborative study and group projects). For instance, one of the main features attracting students to learning commons is quiet spaces for individual study that are free from some of the distractions that are likely to exist at home (Anders, Calder, Elder, & Logan, 2009; Bennett, 2006; Lee & Tan, 2011) and when surveyed, students frequently ask for "more or better enforced silent study spaces" (Lee & Tan, 2011). Survey findings typically show that while students want places to study quietly on their own, they don't want to be totally isolated, and often find the presence of other people to be motivating, when it doesn't lead to interruptions. Anders et al. (2009, p. 41) call this "silent peer support". Bennett explains that "students often place their study habits in a social context and see their goal as not eliminating the social dimension of learning but as regulating the social dimension" (2006, p. 18).

This student perspective of studying in the open, while highly nuanced and sensitive, does not make mention of how – or whether – students might like to engage with staff in these spaces. Students' study habits seem to be conceptualised on a spectrum from "isolated study" to "collaborative study" (Bennett, 2006) and there is no sense that the student might seek to engage a staff member in their study at any point. Within this highly constrained construct, L3 staff could only identify themselves as one of the potential "distractions" or "interruptions", or as a peripheral "motivating presence", but there was no scope to be actively engaged in the students' study in any way.

5. Open vs. gatekeeping

When a staff presence in learning commons is explicitly conceptualised, it is primarily as a "service" presence. Staff exist as purveyors of a range of things: information, answers, access to technology, help, and support. The importance of access as a measure of the success of these spaces drives staff to measure their effectiveness in terms of availability, speed and volume. Staff need to be available at a broader range of times in the day so answers can be provided when needed, the answers must be prompt, and greater levels of engagement (such as door counts) are a critical indicator of success. While this construction of staff as a service is congruent with the aims of UniSA in this pilot project, given the intention was to provide a single point of contact for a range of university services, it does not sit comfortably with how the language and learning team sees its own work. The team has been restructured with a very clear model of engagement in mind – one that is pro-active, strategic and targeted to particular students identified as needing additional support. This model of service, however, is reactive, open to all, and not discerning about who can access it. L3 advisers found themselves caught between a discourse that advocates a shift in approaches to learning that most ALL staff would

profess to practice already, and a service-oriented discourse that promotes fast and easy access to information and services as an important measure of success.

6. Naming the space

One of the unexpected tensions arising from the shift toward practice in an open space was that of the name, or more precisely in this case, the lack of an agreed name for the learning space. It is argued that this lack of an agreed name has had an effect of the perception of this learning space for L3 staff, other staff on the campus and, more importantly, for students. Similar informal learning spaces in other universities, particularly in the United Kingdom, are identified by names such as hub, street, atrium, drop-in centre, information or learning commons and learning café (Boys, 2011). Such names may convey to students an open, informal gathering point where they can relax, exchange information, access services and learn. Many of these learning spaces are conceived to function as student service malls (Boys, 2011). In this pilot, the original architectural plans presented to staff referred to the informal learning space as "student experience". In subsequent staff meetings and email correspondence the area was variously identified as "student learning space", "student space", "open space" and "open learning space". For consistency, in this article the area has been referred to as the "open learning space" (OLS), but at no point in this pilot has the area been given an official name, and most surprising of all, no name has been formally or informally promoted to students. Indeed, the OLS has not had an official launch, which has led to confusion amongst staff and students about who and what "it" is for. In student workshops and in-course presentations where L3 staff have had to promote their drop-ins, the OLS has been referred to with descriptors such as "the new open area in the library" or "the area near the new reception pods". In a joint presentation with staff from the Library, L3 staff heard the area referred to as "the library refurbishment". It is evident that this lack of an agreed name not only hinders the promotion of both the area and the language and learning drop-ins, but also has the potential to create confusion and tension amongst the range of stakeholders who have a role to play in the space.

From an educational perspective, if informal learning spaces are to achieve their aim, then it is important that students "should identify these spaces as their own" (Tibbets, 2008, p. 8). This raises a further tension about the lack of a name for the OLS. Part of that identification with the space would seem to be associated with the name. It is interesting to note that the literature surveyed for this article pertaining to learning spaces in Higher Education, remains relatively silent on the importance of and impact of the name of such learning spaces. Names are listed, but little is said as to who designates these names and in particular, if students are consulted in the naming process. Indeed, it could be speculated that names like hub, atrium, café and street have more of an architectural or planning nuance than perhaps names that might be generated by students for students, for example; what is conveyed to students by the names used is a topic worthy of future investigation. With no agreed name for the OLS, official or otherwise, it is hard to imagine that this promotes student identification with the space. Indeed, anecdotal evidence obtained during the L3 team's drop-ins suggests that students, unsurprisingly, refer to the OLS as "in the library". The lack of a name and a student launch clearly has been a shortcoming in the roll-out of the OLS.

7. Ownership: Student space vs. institutional space

The nexus between identification and name is linked in turn with another tension for L3 staff operating in the OLS, namely ownership of the space. One of the first questions raised by L3 staff during LTU meetings prior to the launch was, "Whose space is it?" This question was posed because it soon became apparent that the LTU was formally scheduling activity in the OLS for the forthcoming study period when up to that point, L3 staff had been informed that this was to be a student space. To staff, a student space seemed to imply that "the students are given a location that 'belongs' to them" (Tibbets, 2008, p. 8). The LTU scheduling drop-ins, displaying signage and mounting displays seemed to L3 staff to be intrusive and conveying a message that staff were determining what would happen in the OLS. This seemed counter-

intuitive for a space belonging to students. This perception was heightened to some extent when some Library staff began inspecting the OLS while students were using it and removing some of the LTU publicity signage from tables and walls, indicating that perhaps the Library felt a strong sense of ownership. Clearly there were differing conceptions among the combined service units of whose space it was. Whilst some of these issues have been resolved through negotiation and to some extent evolving practice, the fundamental question of whose space it is remains unanswered.

To determine what students thought about the notion of ownership or whose space it was, a question was included in a brief survey of those who had used the L3 drop-ins: "If you were told this space was 'student owned' what would this mean to you, and is this important?" While the wording of this question proved to be problematic for some students, perhaps because it lacked a specific reference to the OLS, the following statements, excerpted from the survey, are indicative of the range of observations:

> "Good chill out space"

> "Would be good to have an area allocated for students, although may not be able to get help as easily"

> "Less inclined to seek help from the area"

> "Because it involves students and it encourages other students to seek consultation as I did!"

> "Students have the rights to use this space and demand what services that's best from them"

From the above responses, some students conceptualised a student-owned area as a space where staff would collaborate with students, some saw it as a space that students would control, and some saw it as a space where staff involvement may be limited or absent. Students, like staff, seem to hold diverse views about the meaning and value of space "ownership". This tension, along with that of the name, it could be argued, is indicative of a more fundamental unresolved tension; namely, what is the purpose of this particular OLS and the role an ALL team has in it?

8. Conclusion

This paper is entitled "Lost in (open learning) space" because the L3 team felt that a number of things were indeed "lost" in the space. The first and fundamental thing that was lost was the set of philosophies that notionally underpinned it. Openness, collaboration, flexibility, and student ownership: all were highly compromised in the ways the OLS ended up working in practice. With hindsight, the shortcomings of the OLS could be said to stem back to its stated purpose, which was more managerial than pedagogic: to create a shared services model. Without an explicit purpose that related to student learning, and a corresponding design of service delivery that spanned all the teams coming together in the space, the agenda became one of equitably *sharing* the OLS, rather than collaborating more genuinely within it. An insight is provided by Wainwright who argues that "the key to collaborative facility success is not co-location, but the total re-design of service delivery within an integrated university approach" (2004, p. 4). The approach of teams to their use of the OLS at Mawson Lakes appears to align with a co-location model rather than an integrated one. The schedules that had to be painstakingly negotiated and drawn up outlining who would be using the space and when; the secure division between student and staff areas; the designation of particular areas and pieces of furniture for certain uses, and the ongoing questions about ownership of the space – all meant that in practice the space fell well short of its ideals.

However, the OLS *did* help the L3 team to achieve more openness, flexibility, student ownership, and collaboration in their English language model. The invitation to use the OLS for experimenting with new practices, and the pressure to ensure the new space was a success meant that the team was able to step outside the bounds of the model that had shaped their practice in the previous year. Their consultations with students became more open in terms of

student access and more flexible in terms of the topics that could be covered. The consultations then, rather than being entirely managed and constrained by the team and its goals, became more student driven. In terms of collaboration, teams that normally worked on separate campuses with their own student cohorts came together to discuss the implications of this pilot for the larger campus. So while the team certainly felt a range of tensions pertaining to what the space was "supposed" to do and what it did in practice, they felt their interactions with students, that had been so constrained by the model, were enhanced by how they were able to operate in the OLS.

References

Anders, D., Calder, A., Elder, K., & Logan, A. (2009). Investigating the dynamics of an integrated learning space at James Cook University. In D. Radcliffe, H. Wilson, D. Powell, & B. Tibbetts (Eds*.), Learning spaces in higher education: Positive outcomes by design.* Proceedings of the Next Generation Learning Spaces 2008 Colloquium (pp.39-44). Brisbane: University of Queensland. Retrieved April 1, 2013, from http://www.uq.edu.au/nextgenerationlearningspace/proceedings

Association for Academic Language & Learning. (2013). *About us*. Retrieved May 25, 2013, from http://www.aall.org.au/about/.

Bennett, S. (2006). The choice for learning. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *32*(1), 3-13.

Bennett, S. (2007). First questions for designing higher education learning spaces. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *33*(1), 14-26.

Boys, J. (Jan. 2011). *Towards creative learning spaces: Re-thinking the architecture of post-compulsory education*. New York: Routledge.

Craswell, G., & Bartlett, A. (2002). Changing identities: LAS advisers. In U. Fischer, B. James, A. Percy, J. Skillen, & N. Trivett (Eds.), *Changing Identities: Proceedings of the 2001 Australian Language and Academic Skills Conference.* Wollongong: Learning Development, University of Wollongong. Retrieved May 25, 2013, from http://learning.uow.edu.au/LAS2001/selected/craswell.pdf.

Huyton, J. (2009). Significant personal disclosure: exploring the support and development needs of HE tutors engaged in the emotion work associated with supporting students. *Journal of Learning Development in Higher Education*, *1*, 1-18.

Jamieson, P. (2009). The serious matter of informal learning. *Planning for Higher Education*, *37*(2), 18-25.

Lee, N., & Tan, S. (2011). *A comprehensive learning space evaluation model: Final report 2011*. Australian Learning & Teaching Council, Strawbery Hills, NSW.

Oblinger, D. (2005). Leading the transition from classrooms to learning spaces. *EDUCAUSE Quarterly*, *28*(1), 14-18.

Murray, N. L. (2010). Conceptualising the English language needs of first year university students. *The International Journal of the First Year in Higher Education*, *1*(1), 55-64.

Pinder. J., Parkin, J., Austinm, S., Duggan, F., Lansdale, M., & Demian, P. (2009). *The case for new academic workspaces*. Loughborough: Department of Civil and Building Engineering, University of Loughborough.

Stevenson, M., & Kokkinn, B. (2007). Pinned to the margins? The contextual shaping of academic language and learning practice. *Journal of Academic Language and Learning*, *1*(1), A44 – A54. Retrieved May 25, 2013 from

http://journal.aall.org.au/index.php/jall/issue/view/2

Tibbetts, B. (2008) *Next Generation Learning Spaces 2008 Colloquium Report.* Retrieved from http://www.uq.edu.au/nextgenerationlearningspace/NGLSCollRep08.pdf.

UniSA. (2010). *$95m green learning centre.* Retrieved May 25, 2013, from http://w3.unisa.edu.au/unisanews/2010/july/story1a.asp.

UniSA. (2011). *University of South Australia releases ambitious vision for its campuses*. Retrieved May 25, 2013, from http://w3.unisa.edu.au/news/2011/070911.asp.

Wainwright, E. (2004, September). People, networks, books: New strategies for university academic information and service delivery. Paper presented at *ALIA 2004 Biennial Conference*, Gold Coast, Australia. Retrieved July 3, 2013, from http://conferences.alia.org.au/alia2004/conference.papers.html

Wright, J. (2011). *Learning and Teaching Unit learning advisory services team: Managing change discussion paper*. University of South Australia.