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Abstract

This paper reports the findings which have emerged from a survey of 368 academics who represent 42% of the full-time staff at a major university. The questionnaire was very comprehensive containing almost 200 items. Some of the main issues addressed were: the relationship between teaching and research, publications, staff selection/induction/promotion and student learning and the value placed on teaching and learning by various groups or levels within the university. Results revealed large differences in the perceived value placed on teaching and research by university administration, school/department, and individual academic staff. Of interest was the significant difference between the perceptions of academic staff who had a teaching qualification and those who did not. Indeed significant differences in perception were apparent across professional and teaching qualifications, gender, teaching service, academic position and status, and faculty affiliation. These findings have wide implication for academic staff development programs and the actions of universities responding to recent moves toward quality
assurance and the advancement of quality teaching and learning in universities.

INTRODUCTION

With the advent of quality audits of universities nationally, particularly the specific focus on teaching and learning of the 1994 quality audit, and the prominence of the Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching, teaching in universities in Australia has received a timely boost. This paper reports findings from a study commissioned to investigate the perceptions of teaching and learning held by academic staff in a large Australian University. The brief given for this study was to survey academic staff in the university and report on:

- how they value teaching in the university, particularly in relation to other aspects of academic life ie., administration, research and publishing.

- the attitudes they hold about teaching and teaching processes in the university.

- their perceptions of the importance and place of teaching in the university.

Many large surveys investigating university teaching and academic work have been conducted overseas since the late 1960's, however, it is only since the latter part of the 1980s that much has been done in Australia (Neumann, 1993). In outlining a recent qualitative study based on interviewing lecturers about academic work in universities, Neumann reported finding 64 documents on the topic, 33 of which referred to the nexus between university teaching and research, however 'a few only' endeavoured to explain this relationship and explore the concepts further. While the study reported in this paper has covered a broad range of issues that may be related to teaching (e.g., research, publications, promotion, administrative policy etc), this paper focuses mainly on how academics value teaching, especially how teaching related to research, how academics rate themselves on various aspects of teaching, and how this compares across different groups within the university. A full report of the study is contained in Valuing Teaching and Learning: Academic Staff Perceptions (Baker, 1994).
The conceptual framework which emerged and guided the development of the survey instrument was derived from: a) an analytically based definition of what is teaching, b) literature outlining what it is that teachers do, c) a model of the study of teaching well established for use in educational research, d) current documents used by universities as guidelines for quality teaching in universities (eg., AV-CC Guidelines for Effective University Teaching, HERDSA Checklist for effective teaching), and e) academic staff and stakeholders with a special interest in the project.

Teaching, in the educative sense of the word and for the purposes of this study, is defined as "an activity engaged in by a teacher, using procedures in such a way that content, deemed to be of value, is acquired by students through processes involving their understanding. The whole activity is directed toward a goal (short, intermediate, and long term) and takes place in a context of an immediate situation and a wider environment of nature, society and culture (Hogg & Foster, 1974).

The study of teaching may best be viewed within a framework that considers variables such as the key people: the teachers and students, their abilities, experiences, qualifications and training; resources such as curriculum content and materials, and the context of setting, community, culture; the process variables associated with interaction between teachers, students; and the outcome variables such as achievement of short term, intermediate, and long term goals (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974; Arends, 1992).

What teachers actually do can be separated into three main areas:

- the executive function eg., leadership, planning, allocating of resources (human, material, time, space), organizing the learning environment, and controlling and managing learners and reward systems;

- the interactive function of teaching eg., the instructional delivery strategies designed to incorporate specific learning processes or activities, and the teaching processes which achieve particular learning effects;

- the organizational functions of teaching eg., working with others toward the common goals of the organization, helping improve the organization, and professionally developing as a contributing member of the organization. Effective teachers, in
carrying out these functions, distinguish themselves by exhibiting control of a knowledge base, a repertoire of best practices, the attitude and skills necessary for analysis, evaluation, reflection and problem solving, and a commitment to learning to teach as a lifelong process (Arends, 1992; Berliner, 1982).

The focus for this survey was derived from a framework based on the above perspective of teaching and set in the context of the university’s organizational structures, that is, the administrative hierarchy and academic divisions, schools and departments, and individual academic staff.

METHOD

In February and March 1993, preliminary interviews were held with academic staff who were considered stakeholders and who held a special interest in the project. These interviews together with current literature on quality teaching in universities (eg., HERDSA, AV-CC Guidelines), were instrumental in defining the scope and purpose of the study and the issues to be investigated. From the initial interviews a pool of questions were derived and a mail survey questionnaire designed. Preliminary drafts of the questionnaire were piloted with a small number of academic staff representing different disciplines. Comments and suggestions from this group were incorporated into the final lengthy version of the instrument (see Appendix). The majority of the pilot personnel felt items in the final draft version were important and should be included, despite a desire to reduce the length of the instrument.

The final version of the questionnaire consisted of fixed format (mostly Likert Scale attitude statements) and open ended items. Considering the comprehensiveness of the instrument a return rate of 42% (N=368) was considered to be a reasonable result (eg., the previous response rate of a 1992 survey of academic staff was 37%). However, the actual response rate was probably better than 50% if staff who were absent (eg., ill, on leave, attending conferences, etc) had been taken into consideration. This estimate is based on a follow-up telephone interview of a sample of 50 staff which revealed 15 academics absent from campus for a period of two weeks or more, for many of the reasons outlined above.

Sample

The demographic characteristics of the respondents (see Table 1) indicate their representativeness as a sample of the total
academic population of the university. Based on the institutional data available (i.e., sex, position, status, years of service, divisional representation) the sample profile appeared to be reasonably representative of the overall university academic population profile.

In terms of gender representation in the survey sample, the return rate of females was better and females are slightly over-represented in the sample while males were slightly under-represented (i.e., by 4%). The sample characteristics of academic position and status were almost identical with those of the university's population profile.

It is in 'Years of service' that one of the largest differences between the population and sample demographic profiles has been recorded. Academics who have been at the university for 2-5 years responded well and are over-represented in the sample (by 10%) while a poor response from the 6-10 year service group resulted in them being similarly under-represented. Other population statistics (e.g., qualifications, teaching qualifications, and teaching hours) with which to compare the two demographic profiles, were not available. The reasons for the lower response rate and subsequent under-representativeness of some groups and the effect, if any, this may have on the results of the survey are unclear.

The fixed format Likert scales and other quantitative data items were analysed using LERTAP (Nelson, 1986) and SPSS for Windows V5.02 (Norusis, 1992). Open ended items were analysed and coded by using a content analysis process (Borg & Gall, 1989).

Six classes per week was the most frequently reported 'class loading' with more than 75% of the respondents teaching between 3 and 6 classes each week. In contrast, almost 75% reported little or no hours (0-3 hours) officially allocated for research with approximately 20% allotted 4-9 hours (mode=4 hours).

Almost one-third of the respondents reported teaching first year students, with two-thirds teaching other under-graduate levels and almost one-half teaching post-graduate students. Staff reported later in this survey that teaching post graduate students increases the opportunities to become involved in research and publications whereas teaching undergraduates reduces these opportunities.

TABLE 1. SURVEY SAMPLE: Demographic Characteristics Profile
Academic Staff (N = 368) 42% of the population

Response University
Sample Population

Sex Male 62% 66%
Female 38% 34%

Position: Assoc. Lecturer 16% 17%
Lecturer 45% 44%
Senior Lecturer 24% 23%
Assoc. Professor 10% 11%
Professor 5% 5%

Status: F/T Tenured 65% 63%
Non-Tenured 35% 37%

Years at the university University
First Year 10% 12%
2 - 5 yrs 33% 23%
6 - 10 yrs 22% 31%
11 - 15 yrs 13% 13%
16 + yrs 22% 21%

Academic Divisional Representation
Arts 31% 26%
Business 16% 17%
Science 17% 22%
Health Services 30% 26%
Others 7% 9%

Total Years University Teaching
First Year 5%
2 - 5 yrs 26%
6 - 10 yrs 21%
11 - 15 yrs 13%
16 + yrs 35%

School/College Teaching (e.g., primary, secondary level)
Approximately 50% previously taught at school/college level.

Teaching Qualification
Yes 35%
No 65%
Highest Level of Qualification
Bachelor 15%
Grad Diploma 18%
Masters 32%
Doctorate 33%
Other 2%

RESULTS
[Note: Means (M), standard deviation (SD), etc are based on the five point Likert Scale
(1=Strongly Disagree ....... 5=Strongly Agree)
unless otherwise stated]

Valuing Teaching & Research

Part A of the survey questionnaire was designed to discover how academic staff valued teaching and research, how they perceived the relationship between these two activities, and to compare these against their perceptions of the values placed on teaching and research at the school/department and university levels.

Eighty percent of academic staff agreed that 'doing research benefits a lecturer's teaching' (M=4.1, SD=0.9) and that 'academics need to do research to keep up to date in their teaching' (M=3.9, SD=1.0); conversely, 60% also felt that 'people deeply involved in research often neglect their teaching' (M=3.6, SD=1.1).

Approximately 50% of the sample agreed that, because of their 'medium' to 'heavy' teaching load, opportunities to do research were almost non-existent (25% disagreed). This response tallies with the results of the demographic data reported earlier. It appears that between 20-25% of academic staff may have time to be involved in research while an additional 25-30% are involved in research despite being burdened with heavy teaching loads.

A cross tabulation of teaching load and 'opportunities to publish' also revealed a significant relationship indicating that most staff with a medium to heavy teaching load (80% of the sample) disagreed that there were opportunities for them to publish when taking into account their current teaching load. While the distribution was bi-modal overall, it was skewed when different teaching loads were taken into account -- negatively
skewed at the 'none' to 'low' levels and positively skewed at the 'medium' to 'heavy' levels. As 80% of the sample reported a 'medium' to 'heavy' teaching load this difference in perception is significant.

To learn how staff perceived they were rewarded for their efforts, a scale of three items focusing on the rewards for teaching, research and publication activities was designed. This scale ($R = 0.83$) was consistent in its finding and revealed some of the strongest feelings of staff in this aspect of the survey. Respondents indicated on this scale that they felt that the greatest rewards for effort lay in the pursuit of improving one's research and publishing record rather than improving the quality of one's teaching (Mean = 4.1, SD = 1.1). The strongest feeling (Mean = 4.3, SD = 0.9) was that 'A good list of publications carried more weight than a good teaching record' (84% agreed, 3% disagreed).

A series of questions utilizing a ten point scale (1=low...10=high) were designed to discover how staff currently valued teaching and research activity at the personal level and how those values compared with staff perceptions of the two activities at both the school/department and institutional levels. The results of these scaled items are central to this survey and give insight to the findings throughout the remainder of the study.

Staff perceptions of how teaching and research are currently valued by the university, their school/department, or themselves, and how the two activities should be valued, is shown in Table 2. The differences between how academic staff perceive teaching and research is regarded in this university are perhaps no more apparent than in this Table. Staff perceived a very large gap between the way the university currently valued teaching (Mean = 4.6, SD = 2.3) and the way it currently valued research (Mean = 8.7, SD = 1.5). In terms of the 'Ideal' value that should be placed on teaching and research, academic staff rated both activities highly; however, across all levels they felt teaching should be valued more than research.

**TABLE 2 Mean Staff Perceptions of How Teaching and Research are Valued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently valued by</th>
<th>Teaching(SD)</th>
<th>Research (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)the university</td>
<td>4.6(2.3)</td>
<td>8.7 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) their school/dept 6.0 (2.5) 7.7 (2.0)
c) themselves 8.6 (1.4) 7.2 (2.2)

Ideally valued by Teaching (SD) Research (SD)

a) the university 8.8 (1.4) 8.2 (1.7)
b) their school/dept 8.8 (1.4) 8.1 (1.7)
c) themselves 8.8 (1.4) 8.0 (1.9)

Ten point scale (1=low...10=high)

After they had completed the 10pt scale academic staff were asked if they had any comment they would like to make on how research and teaching are currently valued by the university, school/department or themselves. This open ended question resulted in 75 respondents providing a wide variety of opinions about the current relationship between the two activities at the university. They felt that at the institutional level the importance of teaching was given 'lip service', that all the rewards lay with research, and that heavy teaching loads prevented much quality research occurring. Small groups of staff (approx. 7%) were of the opinion that research was valued more because it was able to attract outside money; that the university was just emerging as an university and there was currently, a natural swing to research; that both teaching and research were important; and that it is easier to measure research effectiveness than teaching effectiveness.

An open ended section which concluded Part A of the survey questionnaire, resulted in 84 academic staff providing written comments about a wide variety of concerns relating to teaching and research matters. Many of the comments were lengthy and indicated a number of staff felt strongly about this issue, however, many wanted to provide constructive criticism to improve the current situation. Most comments were about a heavy teaching load restricting research (and therefore reward) opportunities and the need to give greater recognition to teaching so that a balance is obtained -- currently the rewards are strongly in favour of research and publishing. The most frequent (25%) open-ended comment made by academic staff about teaching and research was in relation to the demands of a heavy work load and the pressures of time.
With a large majority of staff reporting a high teaching load of under-graduate students and teaching six different classes per week, opportunities for involvement in research activities among many university academics must be limited. In terms of opportunities due to lesser teaching loads, approximately 20-25% of academic staff appear to be in a fortunate position to have time for research and publishing papers. Almost 75% of staff are not officially allotted time for research.

The second most frequent comment (24%) related to the need to find a balance between the competing demands of research and teaching. Staff felt that there should not be an expectation that all academics be excellent at both teaching and research; that there will need to be a compromise if more research is expected of the teaching staff. We could have teaching positions and research positions and both be equally valued with each receiving equal recognition in promotion and allocation of available resources. The university needs to clarify "what mix of teaching and research it sees as appropriate in the current environment".

There were a number of academic staff (13%) who felt that teaching should be given greater recognition as it is the primary reason for our existence. Some felt it was only being given 'lip service'; that so much was being said about teaching excellence but only the researchers were actually getting recognition and reward. Note that this matter was commented on by 41% of staff in the previous section of the survey when they were asked directly to say how they perceived different levels of the university valued teaching and research.

Approximately 40% of the comments made by staff in this open ended section of the questionnaire produced a widespread view on the relationship between teaching and research at the university. In this remaining series of comments a number of common trends were revealed although the strength of each opinion and any subsequent grouping was less than 10% of all written comments.. Small groups of staff felt that research for teaching knowledge and preparation should be recognised as research; that the current lack of resources make it difficult to pursue research interests; that there are unseen dangers in this blind push of more research no matter what the quality or cost, but it is important to emphasise research more at this stage of our development as a university.

The comments made by academic staff in the open ended section of the questionnaire (Part B), which focussed on Valuing Teaching: Relationship to Promotion, reinforced some of the points raised in the previous section; that is, staff felt that teaching was
not given sufficient acknowledgment in the university, that only 'lip service' was given to it and the real rewards lay with research and publications. The most prevalent comment (41%) related to problems recognizing and rewarding teaching in the university. A second matter recognized by a group of staff was the difficulty of measuring teaching excellence compared with the ease of measuring research performance. As with the two previous open ended sections of the questionnaire a wide diversity of opinions was also apparent among staff.

VALUING TEACHING: University Administration

An eighteen item scale (R = 0.85) was used to learn how academic staff perceived teaching was valued at the institutional level. Eight of the key items in this scale are shown in Table 3. This scale revealed a consistent opinion by staff that the university, by a perceived lack of support for many important aspects of teaching (e.g., teaching staff, teaching facilities and allocation of resources), did not show that it valued teaching.

One of the strongest feelings of staff (63%) was expressed for the item which suggested that 'over recent years there has been a tendency for more resources to move to non-teaching areas'. Only 6% disagreed with this statement and approximately 30% remained unsure. A similarly strong disagreement (63% of staff) was recorded about how the 'university shows it values teaching through the allocation of its resources' (13% agreement; 22% unsure). A large number of staff (41%) disagreed that the university shows it values teaching through its visible public actions, while 17% felt its actions did show support for teaching.

TABLE 3. University Valuing of Aspects of Teaching (5pt Likert Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This university shows it values teaching by:</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) the way it supports its students</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25% agreement, 35% disagreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the way it supports its teaching staff</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23% agreement, 54% disagreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) the way it ensures good teaching facilities</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28% agreement, 52% disagreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) the way it ensures good library resources</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e) the way it ensures sufficient time for good teaching 2.5
   (20% agreement, 56% disagreement)

f) its written mission statements 3.1
   (33% agreement, 19% disagreement)

g) its visible public actions 2.6
   (17% agreement, 41% disagreement)

h) the way it allocates its resources 2.3
   (13% agreement, 63% disagreement)

There was a slight difference between perceived support for teaching development work and research into teaching. Forty-four percent of staff felt 'funding would be available, if they wanted it, to develop new approaches to teaching in their discipline areas' (27% did not) while 48% felt funding would be available for 'conducting research on teaching in their discipline area' (21% did not).

A little more that half the staff (51%) felt that information about 'good teaching practices' was not disseminated regularly in the university while about only half that number (25%) felt the same about the dissemination of 'good research practices'. The contrast was even greater between the dissemination of information about 'teaching developments' and the dissemination about 'research developments'. There was almost a complete reversal of the pattern of responses between these two items. Over 75% of staff felt there was regular dissemination of information about research developments across the university while only 22% felt the same about the dissemination of teaching developments.

VALUING TEACHING: Teaching Processes & Development

Exactly half the respondents (50%) reported they had received 'formal written feedback' about their teaching during the last academic year. Almost exclusively (94%) this was done by students although a number did report they also received formal feedback from their peers (12%) and from their Head of School (9%).

A small number of staff (49) provided written comments to clarify their responses to the items of the questionnaire which asked if
staff received formal/written feedback and if so from whom. The
most frequent comment (20% of the written comments) referred to
not getting any feedback from their Head of School/Department or
their peers. A number of staff explained they received informal
feedback, mostly from students, although a few also added peers
and HoS/HoD. About 15% of the comments were about staff
designing their own form of feedback and receiving feedback from
students.

A ten point scale was used to measure how staff rated the
importance of various teaching practices. The highest ratings
were for teaching practices which employed a variety of learning
activities and teaching methods and materials. This was
consistent with the Teaching Quality Scale referred to later in
this section which indicated staff rated their teaching quality
lowest in teaching methods and learning activities. The
resultant means are listed below in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Importance of Teaching Practices (10 pt scale 1=low 10=high)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written feedback assignments within a week 7.5 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving marking key in advance 7.5 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of teaching methods 8.2 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of teaching materials 8.2 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of learning activities 8.3 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using a variety of assessment methods 7.9 2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A ten point scale was also used to allow staff to rate themselves
on the quality of various aspects of their teaching. The mean
ranged from a low of 7.2 (SD=1.7) for the variety of their
a) 'teaching methods', b) 'assessment methods' and c) 'learning
activities' to a high of 8.5 (SD=1.2) for their 'knowledge
preparation for classes'. However, a low mean of 5.7 (SD=2.7)
was registered for their 'degree of participation in professional
development activities which focused on teaching and learning'.

Most staff agreed that they had adequate training in most aspects

of teaching -- the mean varied between a low of 3.6 (SD=1.0) for
'adequate training to evaluate good teaching practice' and a high
of 3.8 (SD=1.0) for 'adequate training to be a good teacher'.
However, many were either unsure or disagreed that they had
adequate training (see Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Staff Unsure/Disagreed About Adequacy of Training in Teaching Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to evaluate good teaching practice (36%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to develop a course curriculum (30%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to develop a variety of assessment methods (30%)
to develop a variety of good teaching methods (30%)

Over half the respondents (54%) said they would 'attend, in the near future, a short course on teaching and learning which met their needs and was presented by the academic staff development group of the university' (27% would not) and almost half (46%) said they had been involved in teaching development activity within the last twelve months (39% had not).

Seventy-four staff produced written comments on how important they perceived certain teaching/learning practices to be, how adequate was their training for aspects of teaching/learning, and how they currently perceived the quality of their teaching. Approximately 40% of the written comments by academic staff in this section referred to the adequacy of their training in certain aspects of their teaching/learning processes. Almost half the comments said they had 'no training but lots of experience'. Almost 20% of the comments related to the impossibility of getting most assignments back to students within a week of receiving them, however, most qualified their judgements with 'it depends' on the type of assignment and number of students.

Fifty-one staff provided written comments about how they perceived teaching development within their school or department and the most common concern expressed (33%) was about scarce resources preventing any worthwhile development; that is, there was no time and the workload and financial constraints prevented such activity occurring. These concerns are consistent with ratings and comments raised in previous sections of the survey where all but 20-25% of staff reported the burden of full teaching loads reducing their opportunities to actively pursue research and publishing articles.

How Academic Staff Define Teaching

This first item of the Open Comments written response section of the survey was addressed by almost 70% of the respondents and revealed a staff very thoughtful about teaching. The most common definition of teaching produced by staff (30% of responses) referred to teaching being 'a process for the imparting, transferring, or sharing of knowledge and skills'. eg., For me teaching is....

'Sharing knowledge and encouraging the acquisition and application of knowledge and skills'.

'The efficient and effective dissemination of knowledge and skills'.

'Facilitating the acquisition of knowledge and skills'.

'The transfer of knowledge and experience to the next generation'.

'Being a catalyst for students to develop skills'.

'a) Sharing knowledge with students; b) modelling skills and applications for students; c) checking, assessing, and correcting students performance'.

Approximately 20% of the statements defined teaching as the 'facilitation and encouragement of student learning', eg., For me teaching is...

'Developing strategies for learning....'

Providing learning experiences for the development of knowledge and expertise'.

'Empowering others to learn more effectively'.

'Stimulating students to learn'.

'Sowing the seeds for independent student learning'.

'Facilitating critical reflective learning'.

'Instilling a real thirst for students gaining knowledge'.

'Encouraging active participation in learning experiences'.

'Providing an environment which stimulates students hunger to pursue learning...'

'Achieving some deep learning and understanding by my students'.

Other definitions emphasized teaching as being the establishment of conditions or environments for student learning or knowledge acquisition (16%), and the development of the student in preparation for their career (6%). Some staff simply responded to the stem of this item by stating that for them teaching was 'enjoyable', 'rewarding', and 'challenging, dynamic and very satisfying' (6%); however, others placed stress on the importance
of teaching (6%), e.g., 'of prime importance', 'the main purpose of being an academic', 'what I'm here for', 'the centre of my professional life', 'our primary reason for being in this institution', 'crucial to the existence of the university', 'our life blood at the university -- research is an additional activity on top of this'.

Teaching Strength of Academic Staff

Four main areas of teaching strength were identified by academic staff. These were: personal attributes, subject knowledge and experience, teaching skills and processes, and rapport with students.

Twenty-five percent of the comments were about the personal attributes individual staff members felt were a key element of their teaching. These referred to such things as their 'personality', relating their 'personal experiences and anecdotes', having a 'more personal approach', being 'enthusiastic', and 'able to communicate clearly and easily', being 'creative', 'innovative' and using their own imaginative approaches', able to 'be interesting and stimulate student interest', be 'inspiring', have a 'relaxed attitude' and 'a sense of humour', 'not be dogmatic', and be 'culturally aware'. Or as one, who felt a little shy about making any claims about their own attributes, stated ... 'Modesty restrains me!' and another

There were a number of comments (20%) which referred to individual strengths as being knowledge of their subject matter. This generally related to a strong knowledge base and wide breadth of experience in their own discipline area, 'extensive practical and professional knowledge and experience', and able to 'relate to real world experiences'.

A similar number of comments (20%) emphasised staff members teaching knowledge, teaching skills and learning processes as their major strengths. These included such things as their 'wealth of teaching experiences', 'use of adult learning principles', 'being teacher trained', 'having years of education studies', 'a variety of learning experiences and teaching methods', 'making clear any expectations and standards', 'making students think', 'being learner oriented', 'encouraging problem solving among students'. This finding is supported by cross tabulation statistical analysis of teaching qualifications and perceived teaching knowledge and skills presented later in this report.

Many comments by academics referred to their strengths in
teaching and learning processes in terms of the 'organization of teaching activities and materials', being 'thoroughly prepared', having excellent handouts, lecture notes, and overheads, employing classroom skills such as 'a repetition of key points', using 'group processes', 'modelling and demonstrating', 'linking with practical work experiences', 'providing feedback', 'questioning', 'trying new teaching strategies', and using extensive team teaching'. A number of staff (almost 10%) commented on the use of variety in their teaching as being their strength eg., variety in 'teaching methods', 'teaching techniques', 'assessment methods', 'teaching styles', and 'learning approaches and tasks'.

Approximately 15% of the comments about teaching strengths referred to an ability to be responsive or relate to students eg., 'responsive to student needs', 'care about students and their learning', 'attentive to student feedback', 'address individual needs', and 'listen to students'.

Teaching Areas Academic Staff Wish to Improve

Again, as mentioned above, a good response was obtained from staff to a written response item with approximately 70% of the sample responding. The most frequent comments (25%) concerned a desire to improve teaching skills and processes. These included such things as 'presentation skills', 'lecturing to large groups', 'handling small groups', 'delivery modes', 'voice projection', 'making topics and information more interesting', 'encouraging more participation from students', and 'appearing confident and overcoming nervousness' in their delivery. A number of staff referred to variations in teaching: developing a 'variety of teaching methods', 'varying teaching styles', 'trying alternative teaching strategies', using a 'greater variety of learning activities', 'employing experiential learning strategies', 'being more student-centred', and 'encouraging cooperative learning'.

Other comments by staff were able to be grouped into three categories of need of approximately 10% each: a) teaching technology and audio-visual aids; b) current knowledge update; c) assessment methods. The remaining 40% again showing a great diversity of academic opinion.

Improving the Quality of Teaching at the University

Almost 75% of the sample provided detailed written comments about what they perceived as ways to improve the quality of teaching at the university. Approximately 270 academic staff produced 383
suggestions. The open ended comments were consistent with the results of the scales and comments reported in earlier sections of the survey.

Over 30% of the comments (about 130 staff) suggested that the quality of teaching at the university would improve if there was more recognition and rewards for teaching excellence, particularly in the promotions system, and less emphasis on research. Approximately 25% of the written comments of academic staff (~100 staff) suggested the quality of teaching at the university would improve if there were more time and resources devoted to teaching.

More than ten percent of the comments referred to the difference teacher training, teaching qualification, or regular reviews of teaching practice, would make to academic staff for improving their teaching at the university. This view is reinforced by a cross tabulation analysis of teaching qualification with teaching/learning items presented later in this report.

Academic Staff Development Group

The final items of the survey instrument focussed on academic staff development. Respondents were asked if they would attend in the near future a short course on teaching and learning which met their needs and was presented by the academic staff development group at the university. Of the 80% of academics who responded to this item two-thirds said they would attend such a course. Most of the remaining one-third, who said they would not attend an academic staff development course, stated that they were too busy and would not have time. A number (25) said they had no need or it was too late for them.

Almost half the sample provided written suggestions about the content of the courses they would like to see developed, these mainly related to improvement of teaching and learning processes. A substantial number of alternative suggestions about teaching/learning courses were made eg.,

'Presentation modes/methods/skills'.

'Lecture format and presentation'.

'Use of media in teaching and presentation skills'.

'Models of teaching practice.. interactive learning'.

'Use of multi-media'.
'Team teaching, communication skills'.

'Simulation skills'.

'Motivation'... 'making boring subjects come alive'.

'Alternative teaching strategies characteristic of the inventive and experimental approach of the early days -- seems now a relapse to "chalk and talk" techniques'.

'Experiential methods'.

'Small group teaching techniques'.

'Student centred modes of teaching'.

'Independent student learning'.

'Accelerated learning concepts'.

'Teacher training courses'.

'Train the trainer courses'.

The second most frequent group of comments related to a need for courses on methods of assessment. The remaining 35% of comments about desirable courses were quite diverse and covered such needs as 'course development' (curriculum design, syllabus, course planing), developing 'course materials' (new teaching materials, using case-study materials, producing non-print materials), 'time management' (improving organization of my time, effective budgeting of time), and 'cross-cultural teaching' (interacting with ethnic or Asia students, working with overseas students).

The final item of the survey asked staff if they had been involved in any teaching development activity over the last twelve months. Almost 85% of the respondents answered this item and an interesting split occurred. Approximately half of the university academics said they had been involved in teaching development activity sometime during the last year. The most frequently reported activities related to academic staff development activity (eg., Teaching Learning Forum 93, induction course, short courses); development of new courses, curricula or course reviews; development of teaching grants (eg., CAUT); sessions on the development of new teaching materials (eg., multi-media); post-graduate supervision seminars; school organized staff development seminars; mini fellowships;
computing centre courses (eg., computer aided learning) and;

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STAFF & VALUING TEACHING

A number of cross tabulations, conducted to investigate the
relationship between the demographic characteristics of academic
staff and their valuing of teaching, revealed significant
differences between the perceptions of these different groups at
the university.

Qualified Teachers and Valuing Teaching

There were significant differences in perception between academic
staff with teaching qualifications (35% of the sample) and those
without such qualifications (see Table 6) in the way they a) make
regular use of student evaluations, b) know of more
effective ways to teach than the lecture/tutorial mode, and c)
perceive the effectiveness of final exams as a means to assess
students. They also viewed differently from non-qualified
teachers, their adequacy for developing i) course curricula,
ii) a variety of good learning activities, iii) a variety of
assessment methods, iv) a variety of good teaching methods, v)
evaluation of good teaching practices, and vi) into being a good
teacher. Qualified teachers also rated the quality of their
teaching significantly higher in terms of their teaching skills,
and the variety of different teaching methods and learning
activities they used. They did not differ significantly in their
perceptions of their own knowledge preparation, organization of
teaching activities, and preparation of materials for teaching.

TABLE 6 Qualified Teachers & Valuing Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Qualif.Tchrs (Frequency rounded to approx. %)</th>
<th>Non-Qualif.Tchrs (Frequency rounded to approx. %)</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use Student Evaluations</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>p &lt; .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Lecture/tutorial</td>
<td>disagree 70%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>p &lt; .002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree 10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Final Exams</td>
<td>disagree 75%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>p &lt; .011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agree 10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Importance of Variety</td>
<td>a) teaching methods 86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


5. Adequacy of Training
   a) course curriculum 85% 60%      p< .000
   b) learning activities 88% 60%      p< .000
   c) assess methods 80% 62%      p< .000
   d) teaching methods 88% 60%      p< .000
   e) eval. teaching 85% 50%      p< .000
   f) to be a good teacher 92% 64%      p< .000

6. Quality of Teaching in
   a) skills 83% 63% p< .000
   b) teaching methods 62% 40%      p< .000
   c) learning activities 60% 42%      p< .000

Qualification Level and Valuing Teaching

The qualification levels of academic staff were used to split them into three fairly evenly sized groups a) Bachelor/Graduate Diploma level b) Masters level, and c) Doctorate level. Cross tabulations were then used to compare these levels across selected aspects of teaching and learning. The most significant differences occurred in how staff perceived teaching was valued in relation to promotion (see Table 7). The higher the qualification the more they agreed that within the university's promotional system a) teaching was properly rewarded,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Low Qualif.</th>
<th>Hi Qualif.</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Valuing Teaching/Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) University Value T. 5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>p&lt;.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) You Value R. 40%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) You Value T. 90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>p&lt;.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Research Benefits T. 75%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>p&lt;.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Promotional System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Proper balance of Criteria 5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>p&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Teaching Rewarded 5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>p&lt;.005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Proper Weight:Tenure 8%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>p&lt;.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Proper Weight:Promotion 10%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>p&lt;.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Adequacy of Training for:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) there was a proper balance between teaching, research and administration, and c) sufficient weight was given to teaching for decisions about tenure and promotion. However, the strong view across all qualification levels was that teaching was poorly rewarded and insufficient weight was given to teaching in the promotional system.

The higher the qualification of academic staff the more they valued research, the more they felt the university valued teaching, and the more they felt research benefited teaching. More highly qualified staff felt they had adequate training to develop course curricula and use a variety of different assessment methods. In terms of rating the quality of their teaching, a significant difference (P<.03) was only apparent for more qualified staff in terms of their higher rating of their knowledge preparation for classes.

Years at the University and Valuing Teaching

To investigate the relationship between their length of service at the university and their perceptions of teaching, academic staff were divided into three levels according to their years of service eg., a) first years of service (1-5yrs; N=160)  b) medium-long years of service (6-15yrs; N=128)  c) very long service (16+ yrs; N=79). Significant differences in staff perceptions across these levels occurred in a) how they felt the university valued teaching and research, b) how teaching was valued in the promotional system, c) how they were adequately trained in most aspects of teaching, and d) how they rated the quality of their teaching.

The longer the years of service the more staff (over 20% more) that felt the university valued research highly but did not value teaching highly. There were significantly more long serving staff that felt research and publishing pays, that teaching was not valued in the promotional system, and that there was not a balance between teaching, research and administration in the promotional system. The less the length of service, the more
staff (over 20% more) that were a) likely to use student evaluations of their teaching, and b) to engage in formal feedback about their teaching; however, the less likely they were to c) view final exams as the most effective mean of assessing student learning.

There was an average of about 30% less staff in their first years of service compared with longer serving staff that perceived they had adequate training to a) develop course curriculum, b) evaluate teaching practice, c) develop good learning activities, d) have a variety of assessment and teaching methods, and e) to be a good teacher. They also rated significantly lower, compared with others, d) the quality of their teaching in terms of knowledge, skill, and variety of teaching and assessment methods.

Promotional Position and Valuing Teaching

The position of academic staff on the promotional ladder was split into two levels (associate lecturer/lecturer, N = 229; senior lecturer to professor, N = 137) to allow comparison between how the groups perceived different aspects of teaching at the university. Significant differences were apparent between these two levels in terms of a) how they perceived research was valued, b) how teaching was valued in the promotional system, c) their use of feedback on their teaching, and d) how they felt adequately trained in aspects of teaching.

The higher the promotional position of staff the more they valued research (10-15% more), the more they felt the university valued research, the more they agreed there was a proper balance between teaching, research and administration criteria in the promotional system, the more they agreed teaching was properly rewarded, and the more they disagreed that insufficient weight was given to teaching excellence in tenure and promotion of staff. However, more staff that were higher in the promotional positions (_20% more) felt that more university resources were moving into non-teaching areas.

The higher staff were in promotional positions the less likely (_20%) they were to use student evaluation of their teaching or seek formal feedback but the more likely they were to consider they had adequate training in all key aspects of teaching. Surprisingly, in consideration of the latter point, there were no significant differences between groups in how they rated the quality of their teaching.

Gender Differences and Valuing Teaching

There were significant differences between the way male and female academic staff members valued teaching and in the way they
perceived some aspects of teaching were valued at the university. Approximately 10-15% more males disagreed that insufficient weight was given to teaching excellence in the promotional system, specifically the selection, tenure and promotion of staff. About 20% more females were likely to use student evaluations and formal feedback in their teaching. More of them rated more highly the importance of using a variety of student learning activities and teaching methods.

Academic Division and Valuing Teaching

When cross tabulation of selected aspects of teaching were compared across the main academic divisions in the university, a number of significant differences were revealed. Some of the largest differences in the views of staff from different academic divisions (30% - 40%) were in the area of teaching modes and assessment methods. Up to 34% less engineering and science staff than in other divisions agreed that there were more effective ways to teach than the lecture/tutorial mode and up to 40% less the university business school and engineering/science staff disagreed the final exam was the most effective means for assessing student learning. A similar difference of up to 30% was also reported for the university business school and engineering/science staff in terms of their views on the effectiveness of continuous assessment.

In the university business school and engineering/science divisions staff rated significantly different from other divisions (up to 35% less staff) the importance of using a variety of teaching methods and student learning activities in their teaching; however, the university business school rated the quality of their teaching less highly (up to 20% less staff) in terms of their knowledge preparation for teaching and their use of a variety of teaching and learning methods. Similar differences were reported by the university business school in terms of their perceived adequacy of training for using a variety of teaching methods and student learning activities in their teaching.

CONCLUSION

The key findings of the study were that while staff felt both research and teaching were important they consistently rated teaching more important; however, they perceived the current institutional values were heavily weighted toward research to the detriment of teaching at the university. The phrase 'lip service only' was most frequently used in the staff's written responses to how teaching was valued at the university level.
Staff strongly valued student learning and the importance of undergraduate teaching. The majority of staff reported regularly using formal student evaluations of their teaching; however, this varied widely across different groups.

The majority of staff recorded their concerns about the way support for teaching was not perceived to be forthcoming at the institutional level; this was particularly apparent in terms of 'the allocation of resources for teaching'; and the 'visible public actions' of the university toward teaching. There was a similarly strong feeling that over recent years there has been a tendency for more resources to move to non-teaching areas. These views were reasonably consistent across all academic positions; indeed, the more senior the status of staff the more support there was for the view that scarce resources were being moved into non-teaching areas. The biggest differences in this set of attitudinal scales occurred in staff perceptions of how university action supported the dissemination of information about research and development but failed to do so at the same level for teaching. The most frequently written comments by staff supporting these attitudinal scales referred to the positive role of the academic staff development group as a source of information.

The majority of academic staff felt there were more effective ways to teach than the lecture/tutorial mode and an almost unanimous number stressed the importance of small lab/workshops for skills development. Most staff supported continuous assessment and did not think final exams were a most effective means for assessing student learning; however, this view varied widely across different academic Divisions at the university.

In the area of personal teaching development, staff rated lowest the quality of their teaching in terms of their use of a variety of different teaching methods and learning activities -- these two items were also rated by staff to be the most important aspects of teaching processes generally.

Academic staff were grouped according to teaching qualifications, professional qualifications, gender, teaching service, academic position and status, and divisional affiliation at the university, to investigate possible group differences in perceptions of teaching and learning at the university. Significant differences in perception were apparent across most these groupings. The more highly qualified staff were more likely to a) agree with the university's promotional system, b) believe that sufficient recognition was given to teaching, and
c) value research more highly. They were also more likely to rate the quality of their knowledge preparation for teaching more highly.

The longer their length of service at the university the more that staff were likely to feel the university a) did not value teaching highly, and b) placed too much value on research and publishing. In terms of their teaching development, staff in their first years of service (1-5 yrs) rated significantly lower the quality of their teaching; however, the more likely they were to use student evaluations and formal feedback procedure.

The higher the promotional position of staff the more they valued research, the more they felt the university valued research and the more they felt the promotional system was appropriate. However, the higher their position, the more staff that felt scarce resources were moving into non-teaching areas.

Teaching Qualifications and Teaching Development

The Open Comments section of the survey instrument resulted in a rich array of written comments from approximately 70% of the respondents. Staff felt their strengths were in a) the personal attributes they brought to their teaching (eg., enthusiasm, personality, being interesting, inspiring, humorous, etc), b) their subject knowledge and experiences, c) their teaching skills and processes, and d) their rapport with students. The most frequent comment concerned with the improvement of teaching related to a desire to improve teaching skills and processes (eg., presentation skills, alternative teaching methods, different learning activities, etc). Other areas highlighted by these comments were a desire for using new teaching technologies and audio-visual aids, updating current knowledge base, and learning about different assessment strategies.

The most frequent comments staff made about the ways to improve the quality of teaching at the university related to a greater recognition of teaching. They felt it would improve if there were more recognition and rewards for teaching excellence at the institutional level and less emphasis on research. Associated with this 'recognition of teaching' was the expressed desire for more time and resources to be devoted to teaching, and generally, more staff and less students.

More than half the academic staff reported they had participated in a teaching development activity over the last 12 months. Most of this was as a result of involvement in the academic staff development centre activities, however, a number were a result of
individual pursuits. A substantial group of comments referred to the need for more academics to gain qualifications or training in teaching and learning processes. In an attempt to meet some of the recommendations put forward by large numbers of academic staff in this survey and the increasing interest in quality university teaching, the university has since introduced and supported interested staff toward a Post Graduate Certificate In Education (University Teaching) to enable them to upgrade their knowledge and skills in teaching and learning processes and practices.

It appears, from this study, that university teachers who have some qualification in teaching have a significantly higher opinion of their teaching competence and their ability to impact on student learning processes than do non-qualified teachers. Academic staff possessing teaching qualifications rated significantly more highly their own teaching skills and the importance of, and their use of, a variety of teaching and learning activities. This notion of self efficacy among successful university teachers has been posited by others in recently reported studies in Australia.

Dunkin and Precians (1993) recently reported a study which revealed significant differences between 12 award winning university teachers and others in a large NSW university in terms of self-rated competence in teaching. The study investigated the 'conceptual repertoire' of academics (the variety of teaching models available for use), 'self efficacy', and attitude to student feedback. Award winning teachers rated themselves significantly higher in maintaining student attention, arousing student enthusiasm, eliciting worthwhile discussions with students, and giving students helpful feedback. Pitney and O'Neill (1993) also studied ten award winning teachers in a large university in Western Australia and discovered only one had previous training in teaching. This result however, highlighted the importance of a reflective teaching process in the teacher development of university teachers.

Changing the Dominant Discipline Paradigm

In recent address to university administrators, Robert Smith (while Vice Chancellor of the University of New England) reported

on the inappropriate paradigms operating in Australian universities. "The present situation is a clash of paradigms: the internal, discipline - centred paradigm against the one held by society at large, in which the legitimacy of research is conceded only to the extent that it supports and enriches the teaching of
undergraduates." Smith (1992)

Smith reported the work of Pannabaker (1992) in Canada who sees Canadian universities as also employing a discipline-centred paradigm. Pannabaker believes this paradigm is only appropriate in times of economic prosperity and growth. The paradigm, according to the Canadian critic, 'defines scholarship too narrowly -- because peer reviewed publications are easiest to measure -- and allow five to ten years to training academics as researchers, a few weeks of training, at best, in pedagogy and none in administration and management'.

If the dominant discipline-centred paradigm in our universities is to move more toward the paradigm supported by the society at large, then attitudes will need to change suggests Smith. Two preconditions he posits for this change are developing an understanding to the organizational culture of universities and understanding what is involved in effective leadership, management and administration of that organization.

Based on the findings from this survey of academic staff, the seeds of change are there but unless the rewards for excellence in teaching move more into line with those for research and peer reviewed publications, there seems little hope of a paradigm shift occurring, CAUT grants and Quality Audit rewards for excellence in teaching and learning, appear to be making some progress in this direction, however, even the most optimistic of us see little chance of this lasting more than a year or two with even less chance of it becoming an established part of university organizational culture.
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APPENDIX

The Survey Questionnaire

PART A: VALUING TEACHING: RELATIONSHIP TO RESEARCH

Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Not Sure, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree

School/Dept: - use school or department according to which has major responsibility for determining your teaching duties.

Teaching: for this survey the term covers all methods, systems and media that can enable students to learn, whether they be on-campus or studying in the mixed-mode or through distance education.

SDDNA SA

1. Doing research benefits a lecturer's teaching 1 2 3 4 5
2. People deeply involved with research often neglect their teaching.

3. For undergraduates, a reputation for good teaching rather than good research, is what makes one university more attractive than another.

4. For graduate students, a reputation for good research rather than good teaching, is what makes one university more attractive than another.

5. The teaching load in my dept/school is such that the opportunities to do research are almost non-existent.

6. Academic staff need to do research to keep up to date in their teaching.

7. It pays to put more effort into doing research in this university than it does into improving one's quality of teaching.

8. A good list of publications carries more weight than a good teaching record in this institution.

9. The teaching load in my dept/school is such that the opportunities to publish are there if I want them.

10. It pays to put more effort into improving my list of publications than it does to put more effort into improving my teaching.

11. Please rate how you think teaching and research is currently valued by: Low  High  Low  High

   a) the university  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
                      9  10
   b) your school/dept  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
                      9  10
   c) you  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  1  2  3
                      4  5  6  7  8
                      9  10

Any comment?.................

12. Please rate how you think teaching and research should be valued by Low  High  Low  High
PART B: VALUING TEACHING: RELATIONSHIP TO PROMOTION

SDDNA SA
13. There is a proper balance between research, teaching and administration criteria in the promotional system at this university.

14. Good teaching is properly rewarded in this university.

15. Few persons, if any, in this university have been promoted above lecturer because of excellence in teaching.

16. Academic staff at this university should not be able to attain status above senior lecturer because of excellence in teaching.

17. The main form of reward for good teaching in this university should be intrinsic (eg. personal satisfaction, personal growth).

18. Extrinsic rewards (eg, awards for teaching excellence) for good teaching are unnecessary in universities.

19. This university gives insufficient weight to teaching excellence in:
   a) the selection of staff
   b) the tenure of staff
   c) the promotion of staff

Any comment re: matters raised in Part B?
PART C: VALUING TEACHING: RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS
SDDNA SA
20. Friendly relationships with students are conducive to more effective teaching.
21. Students should be able to structure more of their own learning experiences.
22. The quality of students we get these days makes it difficult to achieve good teaching results.
23. Students always have representation on committees which review teaching programs in our school/department.
24. Good teaching of undergraduates is the bread and butter of any university.
25. Students in my school/dept always receive a detailed written unit outline (incl objectives, assessment methods) in the first class session.

26. a) I regularly use (eg. each year) a student evaluation/assessment of teaching form.

b) If yes, is it mainly for (Circle ONE only)
   i) personal feedback
   ii) for promotion
   iii) other eg

Any comment re: matters raised in Part C?

PART D: VALUING TEACHING: UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION

27. Are you aware of any statements issued by the university this year which make explicit the importance of teaching?

28. Are you aware of any statements issued in the last 12 months by senior
officers (ie., DVCs or above) in this university which acknowledge a need to increase the value attached to teaching.

---

29. This university shows that it values teaching by the way it:
   a) supports its students
   b) supports its teaching staff
   c) ensures there are good facilities for teaching
   d) ensures there are good library resources for teaching
   e) ensures there is sufficient time for good teaching

30. This university shows that it values teaching
   a) through its written mission statements
   b) through its visible public actions
   c) through its allocation of resources

31. Most of the decision-making which affects the quality of teaching in this university is made by those with little or no teaching background

32. Over recent years in this university there has been a tendency for more resources to move to non-teaching areas

33. I believe funding would be available in this university if I wished to:
   a) develop new approaches to teaching in my discipline area
   b) develop new student learning activities in my courses
   c) conduct research on teaching in my discipline area
   d) conduct research on student learning in my courses
34. This university regularly disseminates information about

a) good teaching practices
b) teaching developments
c) good research practices
d) research developments

Any comments re: matters raised in Part D?........................

PART E: VALUING TEACHING

Modes of Delivery

35. The lecture/tutorial mode should be the preferred option for university teaching

36. We know of more effective ways to teach than the lecture/tutorial mode but economic efficiency dominates in this university

37. Small group (e.g., max. 20 students) lab/workshops are essential wherever skills development is a desired learning outcome

38. In these tight economic times we should phase out small (e.g., max. 20 students) skill development lab/workshop groups

Any comments re: Teaching Modes?........................

Assessment

39. A final exam is the most effective means for assessing student learning

40. Continuous assessment is the most effective means for assessing student learning

41. Academic staff at this university are timely in assessing student work

5
42. Many academic staff do not provide adequate written feedback about assignments to students.

Any comment re: Assessment? ......................

Feedback on Teaching

43.a) During the last academic year did you receive any formal/written feedback on your teaching? 
   NO YES

  b) If yes, from whom? (Circle any that apply)
     i) students
     ii) peers
     iii) Head school/dept
     iv) others eg_________

Any comment re: Feedback of Teaching? ......................

Teaching Development: Personal

44. Rate how important you consider the following teaching practices to be: Low    High

  a) giving written feedback on assignments within a week of receiving them
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

  b) giving assessment criteria (e.g. marking key) for an assignment well in advance of the due date
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

  c) using a variety of different teaching methods
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

  d) using a variety of different teaching materials/aids
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

  e) using a variety of different learning activities for students
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

  f) using a variety of assessment methods
     1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
45. I feel I have had adequate training to:

a) develop a course curriculum
b) develop new course materials
c) evaluate good teaching practice
d) develop a variety of good learning activities
e) develop a variety of assessment methods
f) evaluate student learning
g) develop a variety of good teaching methods
h) be a good teacher

46. Please rate the quality of your teaching in terms of:

a) your knowledge preparation for classes
b) your preparation of material/aids for teaching
c) your organization of your teaching activities
d) your teaching skills
e) the variety of different teaching methods you use
f) the variety of different assessment methods you use
g) the variety of different learning activities you use
h) your degree of participation in prof. development (eg., courses, conferences) which focused on teaching and learning

Any comment re: Teaching Development: Personal?
Teaching Development: School/Department SDDNASA

47. Administrators in my school/dept assist new teaching staff by reducing their teaching load

48. The quality of teaching in my school/department is high

49. The quality of teaching in my school/department is declining

50. Research into teaching within my discipline/professional area does not have a high priority in my school/department

51. Induction programs for new staff are visibly supported by my school/dept

52. Tangible support (e.g. time, money, resources) is visibly employed in my school/dept to encourage development of teaching

53. My school/department should explore more ways for students to pursue independent learning

54. The last time teaching practices were seriously reviewed in my school/department was: (Circle ONE only)
   a) in last 6 months   b) in last yr   c) 1 - 3 yrs   d) 4 + yrs   e) don't know

55. Over the past 12 months I have participated in at least one staff meeting which focussed on improving the quality of teaching in my school/department.

56. Staff meetings which focus on the curriculum development of our courses are held: (Circle ONE only)
   a) each semester   b) annually   c) every few years   d) seldom if ever

57. Academic staff in my school/department who teach the same students liaise regularly each semester.

58. A coordinator is always designated in my school/dept whenever a group of academic staff in teach the same unit in a semester.
Any comment re: Teaching Development: School/Department?

PART F: BACKGROUND INFORMATION
Name (Optional)

(Circle ONE only)

59. Sex: Male Female ___

   (assoc. lect) (lecturer) (senior lect) (assoc. prof.) (professor)

61. Status: Full-time Tenured Short-term Contract Casual Part-time
   (non-tenured) (green card)

62. a) Number of years you have been teaching at the university:
   0 - 12 - 56 - 1011 - 1516 +
   ___

   b) Number of years you have taught at school/college level (eg., primary/secondary):
   0 - 12 - 56 - 1011 - 1516 +
   ___

   c) Total number of years you have taught at a university/tertiary level:
   0 - 12 - 56 - 1011 - 1516 +
   ___

63. a) Highest level of qualification achieved to date:
   Bachelor Post Grad Dip Master Doctorate
   Other eg __________
   ___

   b) Formal teaching qualification: YES NO eg ____________
   ___

64. a) Hours (official) per week for your current duties as allocated by
   your school/dept.
   Teaching ____ Research ____ Admin ____
   Other ____ eg __________
b) Approximate hours of your time you spend on current duties in a week
Teaching ____ Research ____ Admin ____
Other ____ eg____

65. Hours per week face-to-face teaching this semester?
Nil 1-3 4-6 7-9 10-12 13-15 16+ ___

If NIL please move to Question 10.

66. Modes of teaching conducted by you as % of total teaching time/week (total = 100%):
Large Lecture ___ Seminar/tutorial ___ Lab/Workshop ___
Other ___
(eg. lecture theatre) eg____

67. a) Average size of classes taught (no. of students):
Lecture ___ Seminar/tutorial ___ Lab/Workshop ___
Other eg____

b) Number of classes you currently teach per week:
Nil One Two Three Four Five Six +

___

c) Total number of students you teach per week per teaching mode:
Large Lecture ___ Seminar/tutorial ___ Lab/Workshop ___
Other ___ eg____

___

d) Level of students taught as a % of the total number of students you teach (total = 100%):
U/G 1st Yrs ___ U/G Other yrs ___ Post-grad ___
Other ___ eg____

___

68. Your major academic area at the university is:
Arts
Business Engineering/Science
ie._______ ie._______ ie._______
Health Sciences

Other

---

Any comment re: matters raised in Part F? .................

PART G: OPEN COMMENTS ABOUT TEACHING

69. Please state briefly

a) For me, teaching is (own definition) .....................

b) The strengths of my teaching are ......................

c) The areas of my teaching I would like to improve are ..............

70. The quality of teaching in this university would be improved

if ..................

71. a) Do you think you would attend, in the near future, a short course on

teaching and learning which met your needs

and was presented by the Teaching and Learning Group at this university?

NO YES

Why? ..................

b) If yes, what courses would you like to see developed? (please list

ideas)
72. Please indicate if you have been involved in any teaching development activity over the last 12 months.
NO YES (please list)

ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WISH TO MAKE?..................................

THANK YOU for taking the time to complete this form. Your cooperation is much appreciated.

Tear off Slip: Please indicate if you want

a) a brief summary of findings sent to you

b) a follow-up interview

Return to Faculty of Education under separate cover.