

A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS
THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING BY FACULTY AT
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

JOYCE M. JOYAL



INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

**A STUDY OF PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE
DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING BY FACULTY AT
MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND**

by

Joyce M. Joyal, B.A.

A thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the degree of Master of Education
(Post-Secondary Studies (Leadership))

Faculty of Education
Memorial University of Newfoundland
October, 1998

St. John's

Newfoundland



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file / Votre référence

Our file / Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-36142-X

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
I INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Background to the Study	4
Purpose of the Study	6
Significance of the Study	7
Limitations of the Study	7
II SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	9
Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching	9
Faculty Professional Development in Teaching	13
University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching	21
III DESIGN OF THE STUDY	26
Methodology	26
Rationale for Case Study Approach	27

Data Collection	28
Interviews	28
Documents	29
Other Source	29
Data Analysis	29
IV PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	31
1. Documents	31
2. Interviews	43
V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	83
REFERENCES	91
APPENDICES	95
Appendix A	95
Appendix B	100

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
Summary Table 1: Faculty Professional Development in Teaching	66
Summary Table 2: Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching/University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching	81

I**INTRODUCTION**

Professional development of employees has become a common expectation and feature within most workforces today. With this in mind, this study examines how a select number of faculty members and administrators at Memorial University of Newfoundland (hereafter referred to as MUN) perceive the place and role of professional development in the teaching carried out by faculty members at MUN. A number of factors have contributed to the growing trend of professional development for faculty in the area of teaching at universities. The combination of ever-growing budgetary problems at universities (the result of a decline in the level of public financial support); an increase in the number of older students; an emerging awareness of new skills and understandings that will be required for effective functioning in a changing society; a buyer's market for students with regard to educational opportunities; and an increased demand for accountability by parents, members of government and the general public all form part of the reasons why professional development in teaching for faculty members is important today (Tucker, 1992, p. 264; O'Keefe, 1985, p. 2; Gaff, 1985, p. 138).

Increasingly, then, many faculty members at universities are looking to find ways to develop their professional skills in teaching. Many are realizing that they must accept responsibility for managing their own change and renewal processes; without these processes, stagnation and irrelevance in teaching may increase (Tucker, 1992, p. 267). For instance, many want to be

more innovative in their teaching methods, to make the teaching and learning experience more interesting, relevant, and effective for students and themselves, to find ways of dealing with issues or trying to solve problems that are common in the university classroom, or to be able simply to become more efficient in their day-to-day work. In addition, there is an increasing demand on the part of university administration (and the public in general) for greater accountability of faculty members. There are reasons why professional development might be desirable in university teaching. A variety of activities can be employed and incentives can be put in place to encourage faculty at all levels and stages of their careers to think about professional development in teaching.

To promote better learning on the university campus, faculty members who are responsible for instruction should be given the support needed to develop their professional skills in teaching and there should be a continuing commitment to the development of activities for faculty (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 1; Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 15). Faculty need to have opportunities consistently for their development so that they can monitor and analyze their own teaching methods and effectiveness, and adapt and upgrade when it is required of them. Communication between faculty members is important in order to foster a common purpose in teaching, a commitment to and support of the teaching and learning process, and a collegiality so that a sense of community can be cultivated (Gaff, 1983, p. 154). Support can be given to faculty in the form of professional development seminars, workshops, discussion groups and other activities.

Who benefits from efforts towards university teaching development? Many people do. Students benefit because better teaching results in better learning; faculty members benefit from the pleasure of a job well done, and the personal satisfaction they gain from teaching; universities benefit by receiving recognition for instructional as well as research excellence. And when all of these groups benefit, ultimately, the community and society as a whole benefit (O'Keefe, 1985, p. 2).

Statement of the Problem

Background to the Study

Faculty teaching is a complicated enterprise. Techniques for teaching development will apply differently to different subjects and disciplines and will vary, depending on the course and the instructor (Weimer, 1990). The development of teaching requires a combination of factors. Flexibility is required and faculty members must be able to find what works for them and what suits the culture of the university. In addition, it is important to keep in mind that teaching development should be conceived and should occur in a positive atmosphere. Faculty teaching should not be seen as something which may be deficient or seriously lacking, or which needs to be "fixed." There is room for all faculty members to develop their teaching, no matter how effective they are as teachers. All faculty will gain something in their efforts towards developing their teaching, and faculty members and university administrators alike can and should praise efforts in this area. Both teaching and its development are complex endeavors. There are no quick and easy ways to develop teaching; it takes time.

There are a number of different sources for the promotion of professional development in university teaching. First, university administration has a role to play in teaching development; faculty alone cannot initiate and continue efforts towards the development of university teaching. In their roles as institutional leaders, administrators must create a climate which is conducive and receptive to the process and goal of teaching development. This climate can be created by the university administration's acknowledgement of the

ongoing nature of instructional development, by the encouragement of all faculty to continue their growth and development as teachers, and by the provision of resources to support faculty in their improvement as teachers. And although good teaching is expected, it is often not rewarded; faculty who show an ongoing commitment and successfully reach levels of instructional effectiveness should be rewarded. If university administrators are concerned about instructional quality and solidly support efforts towards achieving it, faculty members will pursue this as a goal in their teaching.

So, support for professional development for faculty teaching is, ideally, derived from the institution in different ways. University administration play a role in sharing, along with faculty members, a commitment to the teaching endeavors of the university. This support is also derived from the academic culture within the institution itself. It is important that both of these elements of support exist and, most importantly, are perceived by faculty members to be present within the institution. How much and how well these two elements of support are present and visibly noticed within the institution, is important for the professional development of faculty to exist and thrive in the area of teaching.

But the key to the development of university teaching and to the gains which can be made through teaching development, lies with the faculty members themselves. There is no doubt that faculty members play the central role in the development of teaching. Faculty make choices on how to develop their teaching. They can engage themselves in activities related to teaching and learning and can conduct their own research into teaching, observe their

own teaching performance, and work with colleagues and students to develop the teaching and learning process.

Three key features work together, then, for professional development in teaching to thrive for faculty of the university. University administrative support, academic culture, and the availability and pursuit of professional development activities themselves in faculty teaching provide information on the existence and effectiveness of faculty professional development in teaching. This study examined how these elements exist and are perceived by select members of the university academic and administrative community.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to gain insight into the perceptions of a select number of faculty members and administrators at MUN on the place and nature of faculty development in teaching at MUN. In particular, the aims were to:

1. examine the perceptions and attitudes that a select number of faculty and administrators at MUN have about the role of faculty development in teaching at the university.
2. examine the perceptions and attitudes that the selected individuals have about how the university administration works with faculty to promote and support faculty development activities in the area of teaching.

3. examine the selected individuals' perceptions and attitudes on the academic culture at MUN in its encouragement of faculty development in teaching.
4. highlight the professional development activities devoted to teaching enrichment that are currently carried out, as well as those which might be put in place at MUN.
5. recommend possible faculty professional development activities devoted to teaching enrichment.

Significance of the Study

The results of the study provided information on the nature of the activities currently being carried out at the university, insight into the current topics and levels of interest to faculty in the professional development of teaching, and information about the current general level of support at the University for professional development in faculty teaching. Finally, the study may be helpful in planning for the developmental needs of faculty teaching at MUN.

Limitations of the Study

The study is intended to be an examination of the topic as it relates to MUN only, and represents the views of selected individuals only.

In this ethnographic study, the researcher was relying on the participation of faculty and their openness. Here the researcher tried to make the participants feel as comfortable as possible, assured them that their

responses were kept confidential, and scheduled the interviews at their convenience.

Researcher bias was minimized somewhat by the researcher always being aware of bias throughout the data collection and data analysis stages. The researcher tried to compensate for bias by making a conscious effort to *listen carefully* to the responses that were given by the participants, to *understand* the exact meanings that the participants were conveying, and to *interpret* those responses as accurately as possible.

II

SELECTED REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The following topics and issues have been selected for inclusion in the literature review:

1. Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching.
2. Faculty Professional Development in Teaching.
3. University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching.

Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching

Seldin (1990) says that one way of developing faculty teaching at universities is to establish an effective faculty development program. Most of the efforts in faculty professional development are directed toward research and further study in the faculty member's discipline. For instance, leaves of absence and trips to conferences are usually for research and scholarly activities. Teaching, therefore, is often considered a secondary activity in the duties of faculty members (Tucker, 1992, p. 285; O'Keefe, 1985, p. 15). This can also be seen in the recruitment and selection of new faculty members. Hiring decisions of new faculty are usually based on their abilities or potential abilities in research, since it is often easier to identify and measure good research than good teaching. Therefore, in order to enhance the prestige of the

university and secure outside funding, institutions will more often try to attract those candidates who excel in research (Seldin, 1990, p. 5; Tucker, 1992, p. 283-4). While teaching is considered a private affair that goes on between professors and students behind closed classroom doors, the results of research become public in the academic community and therefore receive more attention (Seldin, 1990). So, the reward system at universities is such that research is seen as the main criterion for promotion and tenure, while relatively little attention is paid to a faculty member's abilities in teaching (Tucker, 1992; Gaff, 1985). But there should be a realization that faculty members require professional development in the theoretical and practical training of teaching. In order to promote better learning on campuses, faculty should be given the resources and support needed to develop their teaching and to grow professionally (Lunde & Healy, 1991).

Since there seems to be few incentives to change, faculty who attempt to develop their teaching are relatively few (Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. 71). Some do not participate because of inertia, others because they are fearful of displaying their teaching techniques, and many because they know that promotion and tenure decisions depend largely on research and scholarly performance (Seldin, 1990, p. 7; Lacey, 1983, p. 99; Weimer, 1990, p. 16; Bonwell & Eison, 1991, p. 55; Tucker, 1992, p. 288). As a result, many professors may spend little time trying to develop their teaching because they believe that teaching will not be seriously considered when it comes to promotion and tenure decisions. Even if some may wish to develop their teaching, they will only attempt to do so when they can find the time between

their research and other activities, which they may well consider more important. So the ethos of universities themselves can create roadblocks to teaching development.

Poor methods of teaching assessment can also hinder teaching improvement. Many believe that good teaching is hard to measure and cannot be evaluated properly (Aleamoni, 1987, p. 26). In this connection, Hutchings (1994) refers to a report submitted to the Commission on Professional Recognition and Rewards which states:

"Every institution should work to develop efficient, robust, reliable, and trusted measures of teaching effectiveness. These could include peer evaluation, surveying of students from previous semesters, studying student achievement in subsequent courses, reviewing syllabi and examinations, and other techniques. The perceived inability to evaluate teaching is one of the major stumbling blocks to making teaching an integral part of the rewards system. It is critical that this perception be changed." (p. 7)

The development of teaching and the evaluation of teaching go hand in hand, since good teaching can only be rewarded properly if it is assessed properly (Tucker, 1992, p. 289). If evaluations are carried out properly, the faculty members themselves can be agents of change in developing their teaching; they will develop their teaching by observing their own evaluations and working towards better evaluation results (Boice, 1992, p. 249). So good assessment technique is very important.

The literature suggests that one of the ways to promote teaching development is to use a reward system. As was mentioned earlier, for the most part, research is usually held in higher esteem when assessing faculty for hiring, promotion and tenure. Good teaching—especially excellent teaching—

should be acknowledged and rewarded; if teaching is to be more highly regarded in the institution, that regard should be visible. Outstanding teaching, then, should be given meaningful rewards (Tucker, 1992, p. 289; Boyer, 1990, p. 73).

As was mentioned earlier, a problem which exists for many faculty members is that the demands made on their time can often keep them from effectively carrying out all of the duties which are expected of them (Tucker, 1992, p. 277 & 284). Faculty members must try to juggle duties efficiently such as preparing lessons for classes, serving on committees, advising students and conducting research (Weiler, 1990, p. 292). A faculty member may wish to excel at *both* teaching and research, which constitute the main activities of faculty members. However, if h/she is to excel in these activities, h/she must devote a great deal of time to them. The result is often that the faculty member devotes his/her time mainly to one activity, to the cost of the other (Lacey, 1983, p. 99). Therefore, it must be kept in mind the amount of time which a faculty member is likely to be able to devote to professional development activities in teaching. So, although faculty are encouraged (and often expected) to engage in professional development, they often find it difficult to find or make the time to take part in professional development activities. In addition, they often do not receive recognition for the amount of time and energy they may devote to professional development activities. It is important, therefore, to recognize that faculty will seek professional development as it suits their needs and schedules.

Those who promote new ideas and innovations in teaching often confront myths about academic life—for example, that good teachers are born and that

the “popular” teacher is academically suspect (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 14). The complaint is also often heard from those who try to promote teaching development that the faculty members who really “need it” do not try to improve upon their teaching and that it is the good instructors who will engage in activities designed to develop teaching (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 14). But all instructors, though their needs may be different, can benefit from teaching development activities (Tucker, 1992, p. 283). Graf, Albright, and Weiler (1992) claim that a faculty development program in teaching can enhance the talents, expand the interests, improve the competence, and facilitate the professional and personal growth of faculty members in their role as instructors.

Faculty Professional Development in Teaching

Gaff (1985) says that faculty can find it refreshing and useful to bring to their teaching what they have learned in professional development activities. In general, seminar and workshop activities for faculty are successful if they are planned thoroughly and well and are neither too wide-ranging nor too focused. The seminars and workshops that will be successful are those which are aimed directly at faculty’s needs and concerns and are genuinely designed to assist faculty in a positive atmosphere of support (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 203). Follow-up activities to seminars and workshops, such as discussion sessions, are also good for increasing success of activities as a whole.

Further, faculty development activities are successful if they are not too time-consuming, so that faculty can easily take part in them without too much

interruption in their schedules. Activities for faculty are successful also if they result in tangible information that faculty can take back with them to their work, if they increase interaction and communication among faculty members, and help to build a sense of community (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 12; Green & Levine, 1985, p. xiv). Finally, the activities must challenge faculty and encourage them to make the effort to incorporate new strategies into their teaching (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 217). Conversely, activities for faculty development are not successful if they cater to routine interests of faculty, lack a sense of purpose, fail to generate enthusiasm or do not offer effective strategies (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 218).

Tucker (1992) claims that it takes time to build a successful faculty development program. Growth will usually occur slowly and attendance by faculty members will be inconsistent—this should be expected. It is often best to think big, but start small in planning activities; a well-planned activity for a small group of interested faculty members is more likely to be successful than a large-scale general effort which may suit no one (Tucker, 1992, p. 274). In this way, a foundation can then be built on in the planning of other activities. It is also often the case that faculty development activities are attended disproportionately by those who are already good teachers (Boyer, 1990, p. 8). However, these people will always be able to gain new insights from activities. Over time, the faculty members who truly “need” the assistance in teaching will attend these activities as well, especially if a system of teaching assessment is in place. If teaching is evaluated, faculty who require assistance will feel the need to attend these activities.

It is important, then, that careful consideration is given to the most pressing needs in faculty development activities. Fresh insights and approaches, as well as special expertise should be brought to faculty development activities (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 12). Lunde and Healy (1991) emphasize that topics should ideally have a demonstrated impact on classroom teaching, relate to a theme, and build a sense of community among participants. Tucker (1992) says that it is important, also, in planning activities, to provide a number of different approaches in illustrating new techniques in teaching; no one technique will be suitable for everyone, and presenting a variety of possible approaches would enable faculty members to choose the ones that suit their own styles and needs.

The extent to which a faculty member may wish to develop his/her teaching will often vary depending on the career stage. Many graduate programs tend to focus on the students' scholarly development rather than on teaching skills. Therefore, new faculty members will likely be drawn towards faculty development activities which deal with lecturing, leading discussions, constructing tests, and coordinating laboratories (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 17). Once they become established in their positions, faculty at mid-career or near retirement may discover a renewed interest in teaching, and may wish to learn new teaching skills. Faculty at this level can gain fresh insight in teaching from being in contact with younger faculty. Reciprocally, younger faculty can learn from the teaching experiences of more senior faculty. So the involvement in faculty development activities of faculty members from a wide variety of disciplines, ranks, and ages can benefit all faculty alike (Eble &

McKeachie, 1985, p. 19). Eble and McKeachie (1985) say that the activities offered by a faculty development centre can, therefore, help to improve communication between faculty members and bring a renewed sense of commitment to the teaching process as well as enhance creativity and build enthusiasm in teaching. They can also help to make faculty members think beyond their own concerns within their disciplines towards larger issues in higher education generally (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 176).

Lacey (1983) claims that a faculty development program in teaching can effectively be put in place through the implementation of a faculty development centre. He says:

An office that coordinates services and draws people together to explore common interests is a small cost within a university budget but can provide a very great service (p. 105).

Lacey (1983) thinks, then, that teaching development activities need to be coordinated in a coherent way—and a faculty development centre can be the way to do this. He says that activities are more useful and successful if they are not offered in an isolated, piecemeal fashion but as part of a unit which has an ongoing and sustained commitment to instructional improvement. Further, Lacey (1983) thinks that offering activities through a faculty development centre gives the activities the importance they require for faculty and administrative recognition and participation. A centre can also gain knowledge over time about the variety of faculty needs in instructional development, and how those needs should be addressed. Weimer (1990) says that these are important factors in optimizing the potential of the overall instructional quality at an institution.

Seldin (1990, p. 17) and Tucker (1992, p. 287) claim that there are four key initiatives on which faculty development centres can concentrate. They can provide: 1) in-service workshops that develop specific skills; 2) feedback that gives professors information on students' and colleagues' perceptions of their teaching effectiveness; 3) lectures and discussion groups devoted to broad issues of higher education; and 4) financial incentives or awards that encourage innovative instructional practices. There are several areas where focus is usually placed within faculty development. In general, focus will be on instructional development, new skills and knowledge about the teaching and learning processes, curriculum development, and evaluation of faculty teaching by students (Tucker, 1992, p. 269; Gaff, 1985, p. 140).

Some activities are intended to assist faculty in bringing new instructional concepts into their courses (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 80; Gaff, 1985, p. 140). Assistance can also be provided to faculty in the development of skills that will involve them in activities that support other university functions such as student advising, student admissions, or other administrative work (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 80). Other activities might focus on supporting faculty's interest in understanding pedagogical issues and learning theories in areas such as adult education or distance education (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 80, Gaff, 1985, p. 140). Activities can also focus on planning and organizing courses, on implementation of different teaching methods, on the use of technological aids, on evaluation of students, on the different learning styles of students, and on enhancing problem-solving (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 14; Gaff, 1985, p. 140). Faculty members may wish to

gain a better understanding of students, who differ in their experiences, ways of thinking and motivation for learning (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 14). This knowledge of students is important for adapting teaching methods and providing a variety of learning opportunities to students.

Activities can also involve “retraining” faculty to incorporate new technology into their teaching work. For instance, the introduction of new computer multi-media programs can change the way a certain discipline is studied and taught (Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 80; Gaff, 1985, p. 140). If and when faculty members take an interest in the new and different technologies which can be used to enhance teaching, workshops can be developed and offered to them on the incorporation and use of multi-media in their courses.

The literature shows that more and more instructors are interested in incorporating different educational technologies into their teaching. As time goes on, educational technologies are becoming more attractive to faculty and used by them. This is partly because these technologies are becoming easier to use, and are therefore becoming easier and more user-friendly for faculty to learn so as to incorporate them more easily into their teaching. And increasingly, faculty are being encouraged to become more knowledgeable about these new technologies, in order to make their teaching more dynamic and interesting for themselves (Doyle, 1996, p. 11). These technologies not only provide new and interesting teaching techniques for faculty but they also provide students with new ways of learning their course subjects. For instance, most students already work with computers in their day-to-day life, so they likely feel quite comfortable when technology is incorporated into their

coursework. Students will also take to learning in this way since many of them will see the relationship of the different technologies to their future world of work (Birenbaum, 1991, p. 5).

Educational technologies can also provide many learning opportunities of a kind which cannot be provided through a conventional teaching and learning format. The interactive nature of many of these technologies can greatly enhance students' understanding of material and can introduce new ways of examining course subject matter. Birenbaum (1991) states that educational technology is a very important area which faculty members are increasingly turning to in order to enhance and improve their teaching as well as the students' learning.

Eble and McKeachie (1985) and Gaff (1985) say that faculty will also likely be required to become more knowledgeable in areas such as distance education. Distance education technology, which ties in with new and developing educational technologies generally, is becoming increasingly important in the delivery of courses. The distance education environment is quite different in important respects from that of a standard classroom. Graf et al (1992) say that seminar and workshop activities in this area will likely be required to help inexperienced faculty operate effectively in the distance education environment.

Another aspect of teaching concerns interpersonal relations between faculty and students. Teaching and learning can be enhanced when students are aware that the instructor cares about how well they are learning material and that the instructor is accessible to them when they are having problems

with aspects of the course. Faculty members may also want to examine how well the information and material in their discipline can be communicated to students and may want to look at ways to improve this. Teaching can be improved when faculty members take opportunities to implement what they have learned from their own experiences and are given opportunities to learn from each other. Both of these elements can lead to continued development in faculty teaching and to increased collegiality between faculty members. The literature suggests that these elements can come about in the faculty members' departments and in planned activities offered, for example, by a faculty development centre.

Eble and McKeachie (1985) think that future trends will also likely focus on attempts to foster cooperation among faculty members as well as to increase communication between faculty members about teaching and learning. In addition, faculty will be increasingly involved in teaching non-traditional students. As the demographics of the university student population change, fewer younger (traditional) students will be enrolled at universities and more older students will be continuing their education. Older, non-traditional students bring different learning styles, goals, and expectations to the classroom. Gaff (1985) thinks that faculty should be aware of these and other subtle differences between younger and older students, and try to adjust and modify their teaching styles to suit these different types of learners.

To finish, Gaff (1985) says that there is an ever-increasing emphasis on making and strengthening the connections and relevance between the classroom and the workplace. He says that this connection has a continuing

importance in the professional schools at universities, but it is also becoming increasingly important in the general stream, non-professional programs, such as arts and science. He thinks, then, that faculty development activities in this area will, therefore, likely grow in future.

University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching

The literature suggests that if the academic culture of a university is to help in encouraging faculty development in teaching, and if a successful faculty development program is to be put in place and maintained, it is important that the university administration offer real and visible support in these areas.

Seldin (1990) says that to help create an academic culture which supports faculty development in the area of teaching, the academic department itself can often be the first and best place to start. He says that, for example, department heads can encourage those faculty members who show an interest in teaching development by seeking advice or taking their own initiative in some aspect of teaching development. In this situation, department heads can suggest further resources and services which the faculty members might seek out in order to facilitate their efforts to develop their teaching. Encouragement of faculty development in teaching at the departmental level can be very important because it is here where department heads and their faculty members must react and adjust to the changes which are increasingly being brought to their every-day life and work in the area of teaching. Tucker (1992) suggests that a department head's ability to lead

his/her colleagues through both the anticipation of change as well as the processes of change can help foster professional growth in the area of teaching for the whole department.

The literature suggests that university administration can further influence academic culture by helping to recognize good teaching as well as good research. This can be done, for example, by offering awards for outstanding teaching. Seldin (1990) adds that good teaching can also be recognized in the promotion and tenure process. He says that university administration can also encourage faculty members to broaden their concept of scholarship and think about how research can be considered not as a separate entity from teaching, but how the results of research can enhance and enrich teaching. In these ways, then, Seldin (1990) suggests that university administration can help to establish a balance in the importance of teaching *and* research at the university.

The literature also emphasizes that university administration can and should encourage proper documentation and evidence of good teaching by encouraging faculty members to keep teaching portfolios or dossiers. The portfolio can document faculty members' strengths and accomplishments in teaching, and provide specific data about teaching effectiveness. A reward system can more effectively be put in place for teaching when dossiers are used. Seldin (1990) says that this information can help promotion and tenure committees in assessing faculty members' teaching. The current Collective Agreement between Memorial University of Newfoundland and Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association includes the Canadian

Association of University Teachers Guide to the Teaching Dossier. This Guide explains how to create a dossier, how the dossier is useful, and how a dossier should be used as part of the promotion and tenure process.

Seldin (1990) suggests, also, that it is important that university administration support faculty with the appropriate tools and facilities for teaching. He adds that classrooms and equipment used in teaching must be maintained and improved when necessary. Further, if faculty members are to try and incorporate new technologies into their teaching, proper and up-to-date facilities in the way of audio-visual, multi-media and other technical equipment must be made available to faculty for use in their teaching.

The literature indicates, also, that a faculty development program can be more successful if the faculty members of the university are aware that the activities are fully endorsed and supported by the university administration. Gaff (1985) thinks that faculty development should be supported both by faculty and administration, and faculty members should be involved in the planning of teaching development activities. Tucker (1992) thinks that faculty initiative and involvement is essential — faculty members should be the ones to set the goals in faculty development activities and assume the ultimate authority for determining the direction and nature of the activities, not the university administration. He thinks that the offering of teaching development activities should help to make faculty aware that their work is valued and that they have support amongst their colleagues *and* the university administration.

The literature indicates that it is important that faculty see that the university administration supports a faculty development program, but they

also require the assurance that it is a program which functions for *their* involvement and needs in teaching. Tucker (1992) thinks that university administration can help to institutionalize long-term faculty development efforts, but the actual choices and decision-making in faculty development activities should be made by the faculty members themselves. Eble and McKeachie (1985) suggest that faculty development activities should leave faculty with the perception that they are considered one of the top priorities in the resources of the university. They say that it is important, then, that administrative support be positive for these activities as well. Lunde and Healy (1991) and Gaff (1985) indicate that this support should not give the impression that the activities are being thrust upon the faculty by the administration; activities which are perceived to have been dictated from the top down will not work. If, then, a faculty development program is to be successful, it is important that it have both administrative support and faculty ownership (Lunde & Healy, 1991, p. 11; Rice & Austin, 1990, p. 32; Eble & McKeachie, 1985, p. 208; Tucker, 1992, p. 287-8). Tucker (1992) goes further in saying that, in fact, cooperation at all levels of the university is important for ongoing faculty development in the area of teaching.

Gaff (1985) thinks that in order for faculty to pursue professional development in the area of teaching, it is important, first of all, for them to perceive the need to pursue professional development. Tucker (1992) and Gaff (1985) think that if faculty and university administration can work together in determining and understanding the university's overall goals and what needs to be done in the area of professional development for faculty, only then can

faculty interest in professional development in the area of teaching be generated. Gaff (1985) suggests, therefore, that the university administrative support of faculty development in the area of teaching can be mutually beneficial to both the work of faculty and the long-range plans of the university.

III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Methodology

This study was a qualitative one. Qualitative research is a method of examining and describing issues or problems by listening to, observing and becoming acquainted with the people one is studying (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). The study examined the multiple realities that exist amongst selected individuals in the university environment on the topic of the development of faculty teaching at MUN.

There is and has been a faculty development program in place at MUN for a number of years. This study, through document analysis and interviews, looked at the attitudes of a select number of faculty and their participation in these activities as well as the attitudes of the academic administrators who promote and encourage this kind of professional development. The study was evolutionary, in that the information gained from the participants in the study led and added to subsequent interviews.

The study took an ethnographic case study approach. In particular, the study examined what it is that select numbers of the university academic and administrative community believe, say and do as they relate to professional development in the area of teaching. It looked at the current practices at MUN, and where the direction may go in the future. By looking at the different perspectives of the participants, a "larger picture" developed of the current nature and place of faculty professional development in teaching at MUN.

Rationale for Case Study Approach

The case study approach was appropriate to this study. The research was carried out in one location and the phenomenon was examined at one point in time. Current faculty development issues were examined within the university environment. Relationships between the issues were examined within and as they related to the university environment in a variety of ways, i.e., through interviews and document analysis. In keeping with the case study approach, no claim will be made about the universal views of the institution as a whole.

Five components of a case study research design which are particularly important are: 1) a study's questions; 2) its propositions, if any; 3) its unit(s) of analysis; 4) the logic linking the data to the propositions; and 5) the criteria for interpreting the findings (Yin, 1989, p. 29).

In this study, the questions dealt with the role of faculty development in the area of teaching at MUN, and the views that a select number of faculty and administration have on this topic. The propositions are that, perhaps, there is or is not sufficient promotion and support (administrative as well as cultural) in the university environment in this area; that, perhaps the current faculty development activities may or may not be sufficiently addressing faculty's developmental needs, and if not, there needs to be an examination of what those needs might be. The primary unit of analysis was faculty development and I wanted to know how it is perceived and could be carried out,

and how it is supported at different levels in the university. These issues were examined within the institution of MUN only, and by a select number of individuals only. These issues were also examined at one place in time only.

The data was linked to the propositions by examining, matching and grouping, by comparing and contrasting, and by looking for similarities and differences in the responses as they related to the research questions. The criteria for interpreting the findings developed from the data; patterns emerged from the similarities and differences which presented themselves in the data.

Data Collection

The data was obtained by conducting face-to-face interviews with faculty members and academic administrators of the university, using a focused sampling method (Hakim, 1987, p. 141): the individuals were selected based on referrals by colleagues who identified these individuals as those who might simply be willing to take part in the project. Data was also obtained through the examination of a variety of documentation produced by university administration.

Interviews

Twelve participants were interviewed. Six participants were MUN faculty members and the other six were academic administrators of the university. These interviews were approximately forty-five minutes each, and were audiotaped and transcribed. A list of interview questions for each group is contained in Appendix A. The participants' consent to take part in these

interviews was obtained and a consent form was issued to them for this purpose (Appendix B).

Documents

Documents obtained and reviewed for analysis included:

- the Collective Agreement between MUN/MUNFA (1996-99)
- Memorial University's Mission Statement: Launch Forth: A Strategic Plan for Memorial University of Newfoundland (1994)
- report: Academic Development (by Dr. G.R. Skanes, 1992)
- report: Information Technology Plan Phase I (1992)
- report: Task Group on University Priorities and Resources: Discussion Paper on University Transformation Principles, Strategies and Priorities (1997)

Other Source

Data were also obtained by examining the formal incentives that have been put in place by university administration at MUN for the development and enhancement of faculty teaching.

Data Analysis

Data acquired through interviews and through an examination of various MUN documents was summarized and interpreted, then analyzed to see 1) what kind of academic culture exists and how encouragement is provided

at MUN towards the professional development of teaching by faculty; 2) the extent and nature of incentives and support that are put in place at MUN by university administration in the professional development of teaching by faculty; and 3) what kinds of professional development activities in the area of teaching are currently being made available to faculty at MUN, and where further professional development opportunities might exist. It was anticipated that the study might reveal areas of interest to faculty which are currently not accessible or which perhaps are not currently being made available to them in the way of professional development activities.

IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

1. Documents

A number of documents were analyzed to investigate their purpose to the people who produced them as well as to the people for whom the documents were produced. The documents analyzed included:

- Launch forth: A strategic plan for Memorial University of Newfoundland (1994)
- the collective agreement between Memorial University of Newfoundland and the Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association (Feb. 26, 1996 - August 31, 1999)
- a report prepared for V.P. (Academic) entitled Academic Development produced by Dr. G.R. Skanes (1992)
- a report entitled Information Technology Plan Phase I sponsored by senior administrators of MUN and carried out by an Executive Steering Committee and a project team (1992)
- final report entitled Task Group on University Priorities and Resources: Discussion Paper on University Transformation Principles, Strategies and Priorities.

Launch Forth: A Strategic Plan for Memorial University of Newfoundland (1994)

This document was the result of the work of the University President at that time, Dr. Arthur May, who felt that the University needed to develop an institutional sense of purpose that clearly defined the university and its goals (p. 1). He felt that planning needed to be integrated to ensure that academic and administrative goals were set in consideration of the overall institutional objectives (1994, p. 1). The President viewed this strategic plan as a thematic perspective that should pervade all of the activities of the university (p. 1). This document, therefore, outlines the envisioned path that MUN should take in its endeavors, including its path in university teaching.

Within this document, under the heading "Our Mission," is the statement, "Memorial University is committed to excellence in teaching, research and scholarship" (p. 7). It goes on further to say that "the university is a citizen of the world, recognizing its obligations to advance knowledge and utilize its resources...;" "the university is dedicated to providing a superior learning environment through responsive and innovative teaching..." "the university is committed to responsible and innovative leadership in developing, transmitting, transferring and applying knowledge..." (p. 7).

The document later states that "a comprehensive theme is **quality in everything we do**" (p. 17). Under the heading of "Quality" it reads "the university will systematically act to enhance quality in all of its services: to students, to the rest of the university community and to external stakeholders" (p. 17). In a section with the heading "Quality," the document describes how "in our efforts to educate, to search for knowledge and to share what we do we must dedicate ourselves to improve upon what we achieve (p.

18). It goes on to say that "In recognition of the importance of teaching, particular attention will be paid to initiatives that promote and reward excellence in teaching." "Our goal must be to promote within the university a culture in which all are putting forward their best efforts and constantly seeking to improve. The university will act to maximize the potential of all employees by investing in professional development, providing the tools necessary for their work and providing feedback on the quality of their work" (p. 18)

Finally, the document states on its last page that "The challenge now before individuals and each academic and administrative unit within the university is to evaluate activities within the context of the mission statement and values and to use the strategic themes, as appropriate, to guide development of their initiatives in teaching, research and community service" (p. 23).

These statements within the mission statement are aimed, directly or indirectly, at faculty members within the university and the teaching aspect of their work. The document, in general, outlines the university administrative promotion of and support for teaching improvement and development efforts for MUN faculty in the area of teaching.

Collective Agreement between Memorial University of Newfoundland and Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association

This document is the agreement between Memorial University and the faculty members of the University. It outlines the terms, requirements, and

conditions of the work of faculty members of the University. In the Preamble section of this document it is stated that "... the main purposes of the University are: ... the development and maintenance of the highest standards of academic excellence in teaching ..." (p. 1). It later states, under the heading of "Duties and Responsibilities of Faculty Members" that "Faculty members have a professional duty to develop and maintain their scholarly competence and effectiveness as teachers" (p. 15)

Under the heading of "Appointment Criteria" the document states that "Assessment of candidates shall be based primarily on their ability to perform the academic duties of the advertised position as evidenced by the candidates' degrees and their records of, and potential for, teaching..." (p. 33). Under the heading "Criteria for Tenure" the agreement states that "The criteria for the granting of tenure shall be satisfactory academic performance..., demonstrated professional growth since the date of appointment, and the promise of future development... the areas of assessment for tenure shall be the following, with the greatest weight placed on a) effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher and... b) a demonstrated record... of research..." (p. 44).

Under the heading "Criteria for Promotion" the agreement states that "To meet the criteria for promotion, the candidate shall provide evidence of a cumulative record of satisfactory academic performance... and demonstrated professional growth... the areas of assessment for promotion shall be the following, with greatest weight placed on a) effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher,...and b) a demonstrated record of research, ..." (p. 47). Under both of the headings "Criteria for Tenure" and "Criteria for

Promotion” the agreement states that for evidence of effectiveness and scholarly competence as a teacher, “Recommendations and decisions shall be based on the evaluation of documentation compiled by the faculty member following suggestions in the CAUT Teaching Dossier. The faculty member shall select the particular components of the CAUT Teaching Dossier for inclusion in the file.” (pp. 44, 47). The agreement includes, as “Appendix B,” a copy of “The CAUT Guide to the Teaching Dossier: Its Preparation and Use.”

This document, then, contains sections which deal with the teaching duties of faculty and outlines the obligation that faculty members at MUN have to develop and enhance their skills and abilities in university teaching.

Report: Academic Development

This report was prepared by Dr. G.R. Skanes for the University’s V.P. (Academic) in 1992. Dr. Skanes was the Dean of the School of Continuing Education. His office was responsible for the coordinated offering of faculty development activities in teaching. The report is the result of visits and a follow-up questionnaire to twenty-two faculties/schools/colleges/departments of MUN. Information was gathered from these units in order to answer: “What can we do to improve the undergraduate academic experience at Memorial?” (p. 3). Some of the recommendations within this report will be described.

The report stated that one of the most frequently mentioned needs of the university was that of improving the general academic culture of the university by holding teaching colloquia and inviting visiting speakers (p. 5). In addition, it indicated that teaching support and innovation were required; that

there should be a facility to which faculty can go for assistance in the preparation of materials for teaching (p. 9). The faculty who participated thought that innovations in instruction already in place should be advertised more broadly (p. 9). The findings also indicated that faculty were supportive of workshops and other learning experiences and that such events should be tailored to the needs of individual units (pp. 9-10, 17, 21). Faculty were also interested in acquiring computer skills and thought that the university should enhance its support for computer-assisted learning (p. 10).

The report indicated that many faculty thought that the university did not value good teaching and that there should be an effective reward system for good teaching as well teaching innovation (p. 12). It stated that the evaluation of instruction should be a unit requirement, that faculty should be helped to become comfortable with peer review, and that the lack of accountability in teaching sent a message that it was considered unimportant (p. 12). The document also states that the most effective activity to maintain or improve the quality of teaching is to recognize and evaluate teaching effectiveness (p. 17). In fact, it was found that faculty performance evaluation and promotion should be tied to both research and teaching (pp. 12, 22).

The document outlined four main approaches to instructional development (p. 23):

- 1) in-service workshops that develop specific skills: specific needs as well as broader ones are important. One of the benefits of broader activities is that they draw people together from disparate units and encourage an identification with the university as an institution (p. 23).

2) feedback that provides professors with information on students' and colleagues' perceptions of their teaching effectiveness: student evaluation for feedback to faculty should be expanded. Peer review should also be encouraged (p. 23).

3) lectures and discussion groups devoted to broad issues of higher education: there was an expressed need for academic fora to discuss issues of importance to the academic life of the institution (p. 24).

4) financial incentives that encourage innovative instructional practices: there should be a source of funds for this purpose (p. 24).

The report also listed the key characteristics of instructional development programs (p. 24). These programs should be:

1) tailored to the institution's culture; 2) structured along multiple-approach lines to meet individual preferences, schedules and styles; 3) supported clearly and visibly by top-level administrators; 4) aided in their design and management by a faculty advisory group; 5) started small, targeting specific needs and groups; 6) funded by a specific percentage of an institution's general operating fund; 7) publicized throughout the year; 8) kept apart from the institution's promotion and tenure decision making; 9) a central source for gathering, selecting, and disseminating information about teaching and learning to the faculty; 10) built on a climate of trust, openness, mutual respect, and interdependence; 11) led by directors who offer strong leadership on campus and work effectively with institutional governing groups; 12) located on campuses where outstanding teaching is recognized and rewarded; 13) held on the bedrock belief that faculty members merit, rather than need, help.

Finally, in a section entitled "Recommendations," the report suggested that travel funds be made available to faculty for the purpose of instructional improvement, that members of the administration consider a policy of course reduction for the purpose of course development, and that they institute a system of teaching evaluation prior to hiring new faculty (p. 30). It also suggested that academic fora be held at least annually, to bring together students, staff and faculty, that a centre be established to which faculty can go for help with the preparation of educational materials, and that a fund be set up to support innovation in instruction (pp. 32-33). It also suggested in this section that the Chair of the Academic Development Committee should continue to plan and provide workshops, other learning experiences and support services for the purpose of academic development (p. 35).

This document, then, outlined the incentives and support activities that should be put in place at MUN to develop and improve faculty teaching at the university so that in turn, the university's potential in teaching and learning generally can be maximized.

Report: Information Technology Plan: Phase I Report

This report was compiled in 1992 in a joint effort, between the V-P (Academic) and an Executive Steering Committee which had representatives from the academic sector, the administration, the library and from Newfoundland and Labrador Computing Services (NLCS). A project team also assisted in the production of this report which had representatives from these areas of the university: Computing and Communications, Library, Academic,

Comptroller's Office, Budgets & Institutional Analysis, Registrar's Office, Educational Technology, Student Affairs, and Human Resources. The report was submitted to the VP (Academic). The purpose of this document was to assess where the university stood with regard to its achievements and goals in information technology planning.

The document states that one of the goals of MUN is to "create, disseminate, and preserve knowledge through excellence in teaching, learning, and research. In doing so, Memorial must strive to be recognized for the quality of our undergraduate and graduate teaching..." (p. 3). The document also states that "If Memorial is to be recognized as a top-ranked teaching institution, it must place strong emphasis on the use of information technology throughout the curriculum...Associated with these improvements in infrastructure will be the environment and support arrangements to nurture the increased use of information technology throughout the curriculum. Faculty must be encouraged to adopt the use of information technology in their courses where appropriate and must be professionally supported in that use. More equitable access to information technology resources throughout Memorial must be provided" (p. 5).

In the Appendix of this document is a section entitled "I.T. Assessment Issues," and under the subheading: "use of information technology in teaching and learning" it is stated that "Memorial [is] behind teaching trends in leading universities," and recommends to "increase [the] use of multimedia, visualization aids," "increase support for courseware development and/or

acquisition,” “change faculty reward systems for teaching innovation,” and “promote information technology enhanced teaching/learning.”

This document, then, outlines the infrastructure, incentives and support which should be put in place at MUN for the increased and enhanced use of information technology in university teaching by faculty members.

Final Report of the Task Group on University Priorities and Resources: Discussion Paper on University Transformation Principles, Strategies and Priorities

This document was produced in early 1998 by the vice-presidents of the university (academic, research, and administration and finance) and is a result of the efforts of this group in dealing with challenges faced by MUN since 1995, and in positioning the university to deal effectively with emerging issues (p. I).

Under the heading “Memorial University’s transformation principle: Adopting a learning focus” the document asks: “Are the curriculum and instructional methods used in our courses best structured to foster a teaching and learning environment for our students?” (p. ii). In this section it also says “... the administrative culture must support activities that lead to the creation of a learning focus.” (p. vi).

Under the heading “Proposed transformation strategies,” and within one of the strategies listed, “4. Partnership” the document stresses that “... internal partnerships between disciplines and faculties provide opportunities to develop new approaches to knowledge, teaching and learning.” (p. iii). Another strategy listed is “6. Valuing scholarship.” Under this section it is stated “... in

recent years a more comprehensive perspective has evolved to include the concepts of integration, application, and teaching... in the realm of scholarship." (p. iii).

One of the priorities listed in the report is entitled: "Priority #4: Ensuring programs meet high quality standards of curriculum and instruction" (p. vi). Within this section, the document says "The university will make use of people with critical experience and successful methods in teaching to promote teaching excellence throughout the organization." "Memorial will visibly support excellent teaching, and will encourage those who win teaching excellence awards to promote improved teaching campus wide. The university will investigate funding for the support of developments in teaching, and will investigate methods... of supporting the treatment of teaching as a component of promotion." "Academic departments and faculties will take responsibility for encouraging faculty to participate on a regular basis in professional development and instructional-methods activities in their teaching area. Initiatives may include: substantial initial training and support for new lecturers; biennial appraisal of teaching, including classroom observation ..." (p. vi).

This document, then, outlines the university administration's envisioned path for MUN to enhance the profile and reward system of teaching at the university as well as to promote the development and enrichment of teaching at MUN.

Other: Formal Incentives

There are other ways in which faculty teaching is supported at MUN. One is the President's Award for Distinguished Teaching, an award given to two faculty members annually. Intended to recognize excellence in teaching over an extended period of years, this award is given based on a faculty member's imaginative approaches and sustained commitment to teaching. The award recognizes success in generating an intellectual excitement and in fostering the development of students' skills and interest in their disciplines (McManus, 1997, p. 1)

Faculty teaching is also supported through the activities offered by the Instructional Development Centre of the School of Continuing Education. The manager of the Centre acts as a facilitator and participant in university committee work and in a variety of university activities generally, which deal with issues of university teaching and learning. This Centre also develops, plans, organizes and administers faculty development seminars for the enhancement of faculty teaching. Subject areas of these activities cover a wide range, including sessions which deal with different aspects of pedagogical practice as well as sessions which deal with the implementation and enhancement of technological aids in teaching, among other subject areas.

There is also a faculty newsletter in place which is issued monthly/bi-monthly through the Instructional Development Centre in the School of Continuing Education. *The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial* features articles which focus on current issues in university teaching and

learning generally, as well as articles which are informational or which focus on current topics of interest to faculty in the area of teaching and learning specifically at MUN.

These incentives and services, then, form some of the ways in which the university administration supports MUN faculty members in the area of teaching development and enhancement.

2. Interviews

Interviews were conducted with twelve individuals at MUN. Six of these were academic administrators of the university and six were faculty members. The interviews ranged from a duration of one-half hour to forty-five minutes each. With the exception of five questions, all of the interview questions were identical for each group. Where wording was changed or where questions were added for either of the groups has been indicated. The questions have been grouped according to the information they provide for the three topic areas under examination. Within these three topic areas, one of the topic areas forms Group One. The other two topic areas are combined to form Group Two. Thus, the topic areas are grouped in the following way:

- Group One: Faculty Professional Development in Teaching
- Group Two: University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching
Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching

Group One:**• Faculty Professional Development in Teaching**

What, in your opinion, are the characteristics of good teaching at universities?

When asked this question, administrators provided a range of qualities they thought characterized good teaching. They thought that good instructors should have enthusiasm and be able to stimulate students' interest in their subject, and have good communication skills. They should take a personal interest in, be passionate about and have commitment to their subject. As one administrator says:

You have to be someone who has a real passion for the subject and if you have this passion it's hard for you not to convey that; and that passion can overcome a lot of shortcomings.

In general, the administrators said that instructors should also be able to provide challenging course material that will add value to other components of the course. They should bring their experiences, research, and perspectives to their teaching. They should have a knowledge of the mechanics of teaching and classroom dynamics. They should be sensitive to students' need to be engaged in active learning in the class, and have a good grasp of their material and be able to convey it well. They should be sensitive to learners and intuitive when students are able or unable to understand the course material and be able to make adjustments in their teaching when necessary. They should be conversant with the literature of the subject and stay current in their subject. They should have a great attitude towards teaching and respect for students;

another thought that it was also important to keep things in perspective and have a good sense of humour. One of the administrators thought that the characteristics of good teaching varied depending on the setting of the learning environment. He broke the settings down into three: a lecture setting, seminar setting, and graduate supervision. In a lecture setting he thought it was important for instructors to be able to carefully prepare and organize material for an audience of diverse abilities and background. In a seminar setting the instructor should be able to draw ideas from the participants and make them feel comfortable in doing this, as well as be able to set students' expectations, goals and deadlines. In graduate supervision he thought project management was important; students need help in planning and relating together the different components of a thesis and keep it on schedule. Another of the administrators expressed his ideas on good teaching in this way:

I think people have forgotten what this university is all about, it's not about faculty members; what we're forgetting is that what this really is is a transfer or diffusion of knowledge to the next generation which really is going to be the society of the future. That has been forgotten; my biggest disappointment is that I can't believe so many people forget this basic thing; it's like parents not worrying about their children and just worrying about themselves.

Faculty members also had a wide range of thoughts on the characteristics of good teaching. They thought that instructors should bring current research and current ideas, and reflection and analysis to the content and curriculum of teaching. It also involved excellent organization, making the learning content and experience relevant and meaningful for students collectively and as much as possible individually. They should also bring creative approaches and innovative strategies to their teaching in order to

bring the content to life. There should also be sound methods of evaluation, and connections should be made between the content, teaching style and approach, and the students involved. Students should be engaged with the material and with the concepts being taught. Instructors should gain an understanding of the students' interests so as to tune the material to them individually in ways that spark their interest; connections should be made between the theory and what the students are reading and experiencing in their everyday lives. One faculty member thought that good teaching can only be determined by the students *after* they have graduated. He says:

The students currently in the program dumb it down to get through as easily as possible; the quality aspects of their learning become important to students once they graduate; while they're a student that's not necessarily the case.

Another member thought good instructors should get students to learn how to think and reason things out themselves; to present their opinions both written and orally. They should also be as clear as possible and be available to answer questions. There should also be clear organization, careful preparation and an interest in the feedback from students.

Do you think that there are aspects of your own teaching which you would like to change or improve? (faculty only)

Two of the members thought that they would like to make their courses more current. Two would like to develop their on-campus courses for the World Wide Web. Two thought that they would like to be more organized. The other things mentioned ranged from wanting to improve evaluation skills to being better able to orchestrate the resources of teaching, devise different ways to

present material to students, and generally to improve general classroom techniques. One instructor wanted to be better able to find the middle ground between her own ideas on course content, approach, expectations and knowledge and the needs and interests of the students in order to make the learning relevant for them.

What type of professional development activities related to faculty teaching would you like to see being made available to faculty members at MUN?

Three of the six administrators thought that there should be some kind of peer review evaluation or peer mentoring system. Other suggestions included having faculty members coached in graduate student supervision and guided in integrating information technology into teaching, including using presentation software to organize class materials (it was mentioned that instructors can teach without computers but can enhance their teaching through information technology). It was also suggested that there should be a professional development resource centre for faculty and there should also be a student evaluation system in place. However, one administrator thought that it was too difficult to organize professional development activities because faculty's needs and levels are so diverse. Some of the comments of administrators:

I'd like to see the same type of funding being made available to faculty for teaching as there is for research; for example, going to conferences or teaching workshops that are delivered off-campus. I would encourage the faculty member if they were going to get the funding to come back and give a seminar to the faculty or prepare a paper and present it or did something to contribute to the overall improvement with the faculty.

Another said:

I think different people have different needs because we have different strengths and probably different weaknesses; so that the type of activities being made available might be somewhat what people perceive as their needs; I'd like to go to someone and say, 'here's what I see is something I need help with and here's what my student evaluations have constantly said that I need to do' so then consult with someone whose expertise is in faculty development in teaching to help me. I know that we do have some workshops occasionally and I'm not sure how they're determined in terms of putting them on, whether it's the availability of some expert to do it or if there is actual input from faculty but it would be good if people could have a say. I know that's difficult because we're such a big organization with diverse needs.

Another said:

We need to distinguish between teaching in the Arts faculty and teaching in the professional schools; they're different styles. This is not recognized in universities at all; they have a homogenous idea of what teaching is and it's not true. Professional development has to take place in a non-threatening environment where the teachers don't feel that they're being under the gun. In fact it would be better for them to create an environment where they come up with their own ideas and their own initiative. A lot of the activities could be on basic little things; it's not about serious pedagogical defects, it's simply a question of using a blackboard, facing the class, communicating. Student evaluations should be seen as a cooperative partnership in the class where students try to help faculty members so that the faculty members can help them. And the dean and the heads are involved in making it happen. The emphasis should be on making it happen for the faculty member so that the faculty member can succeed, the students can succeed, and the institution can succeed. That's the climate I'd like to see set up.

Among the activities that faculty members thought should be offered were evaluation of students, computer training (including developing Web pages), activities devoted to enhancing personal interaction with students, performance in front of a classroom, classroom techniques, and activities to obtain insight from a learner-centred point of view. One of the members thought it was important to offer activities outside of the fall and winter semesters as these were busy times for faculty. Another member stressed

how there should be activities designed especially for the new faculty member in the areas of beginning university teaching and research and opening doors to resources, possibilities, and potentials in both these areas. One faculty member mentioned that it is difficult to offer these kinds of activities because there are different issues which exist in different subject areas. One of the faculty members said:

Seminars offered for professional development are just great; the problem I have is that it's really hard to make time for that when you're in the middle of busy semesters; in some ways I wonder about the idea of a mini-summer school or a concentrated 2-3 days probably more in the spring/summer semester that would be devoted to improving university teaching; it would kind of be a dedicated period of time where there would be a variety of speakers and topics and issues about university teaching. Principles and strategies need to be applied to faculty to try and improve their teaching.

Another said:

New faculty are coming in with very subject/content-specific sets of experience/knowledge; there are more generic things they could learn through professional development activities; I think this is very important for new faculty. For people who have been around for a while, such activities kind of help to reinstate values of teaching and provide practical guides/tips such as what's the most current technology and current thinking out there; because people are subject-specific they may not be aware of current teaching ideas. There's also a lot of resources of people and ideas and experience right here on campus. I think the gathering together of those people and resources is important too.

Are you aware of any facilities or activities devoted to the improvement and enrichment of faculty teaching that are currently available at MUN?

Four of the six administrators were aware of the professional development workshops and seminars for faculty which are offered and advertised through the Instructional Development Centre in the School of Continuing Education. Three of these six were also aware of the newsletter *The*

News about Teaching and Learning at Memorial which is produced and distributed by the same office and features a variety of articles on aspects of university teaching. Two also mentioned that they were aware of a graduate student teaching forum where a mentoring program is available, as well as information on creating teaching dossiers and lecturing. Another said that funds are available through her school for faculty members to update their clinical teaching, which form part of the faculty teaching component within her school. Another mentioned that faculty members in the Faculty of Arts have access to the Arts Computing Centre which assists faculty in incorporating computer technology into their teaching; he also mentioned that there are opportunities for faculty in Arts to undertake tutoring in English pronunciation if English is not their first language. Another mentioned that the library also offers some computer-based seminars and that there was, at one time, a lecture series on teaching hosted by the President but she was not sure if this was still being offered. One administrator was not aware of any professional development activities for faculty at all, though he was aware that some efforts are made in this area by graduate students.

Five of the six faculty members said that they were aware of the professional development activities for faculty which are advertised through the Instructional Development Centre in the School of Continuing Education (though one of these said that she thought that many of the topics of these activities are not relevant to her teaching situation). One other was aware of the newsletter *The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial* issued by the same office (she added that she did not find this newsletter useful at all).

One said that he was aware of no professional development activities for faculty at all.

Do you currently involve yourself in any activities having to do with enriching or improving your teaching at MUN? If so, can you describe these activities? If not, would you be interested in taking part in activities devoted to enriching/improving your teaching? (faculty only)

Two faculty members said that they did involve themselves in professional development but that they were, for the most part, activities they did on their own, not necessarily through workshops. For example, one of these said that she is teaching herself how to create a Web course, she reads up about evaluation, reads *The News about Teaching and Learning at Memorial* whenever it is issued, and reads a journal which provides teaching tips for the classroom such as how to create groups and how to motivate large numbers of students to get involved involved in an activity. She said that she reads basically anything that comes across her desk about good university teaching and added that she takes part in workshops that interest her and when she has the time. The other of these two said that she is part of a group in her faculty who get together to discuss different teaching strategies as they relate to critical pedagogy and critical theory; she is also a member of a research group devoted to the development of reflective teaching and critical pedagogy. She says:

I find the reason I'm even interested in being involved with these things is always self-improvement, not only what you can bring to these things but what you'll take away from these experiences. And every conversation that I have or every experience that I have in research contributes to my own self-knowledge; I think that's important even though it's not directly related. I think just being involved with community activities and from being on different boards of directors and

committees, a lot of my motivation for doing that is how it will directly impact on my teaching. So I don't see teaching as separate from research or community work; it's all part of my own goal to be the best possible teacher that I can be; and it all informs me as a person and as a researcher.

Another faculty member said he tries to get involved but that he thought it was more important to have the proper resources in place for courses which incorporate information technology, for example. Another said that she was primarily interested in workshops having to do with the Web. Another said that he did nothing at all; he would like to take part in the workshops dealing with the Web but has no time to do this. Another said she too does not have the time to undertake any professional development activities, but if she did, she would be interested in topics that had to do with graduate teaching. She says:

I don't think there's anything offered for graduate education; everyone is worried about undergraduate students, but that's not so much my issue; I would really like to enhance graduate teaching. I really don't know a lot about that and I'd be very interested in something related to it; eg. how do you enhance really good critical thinking in graduate students and what are good strategies for presenting seminars and different topics as well as issues related to thesis supervision.

What would you say are the reasons that faculty members might be interested in pursuing teaching enrichment/ improvement activities? What would be the reasons why they might not be interested or would not be able to get involved in activities devoted to teaching enrichment and improvement?

Four of the administrators thought that junior faculty members especially would be interested in teaching enrichment activities in order to satisfy criteria for promotion and tenure. They also thought that the senior faculty members would be interested in order for them to enjoy teaching more, to be more effective as teachers, to have more pride in their work, and thereby

feel better about themselves. One of these also thought that perhaps they might seek enrichment as a reaction to feedback from students about the areas in which they could do with improvement. Two of the administrators thought that they might not be interested because the more senior faculty who are tenured may already feel that they are doing a reasonable job and so have no incentive to improve. Four of them thought that the pressures of time also kept faculty from teaching enrichment activities. For instance, during semesters they are too busy with teaching, research (which is not only time-consuming but also is more quantifiable and more easily measured than is teaching in promotion and tenure), and committee work. Two thought that some faculty likely perceive the enrichment activities as being irrelevant and not addressing their own particular teaching improvement needs. One of these also said that perhaps some do not see teaching as an important thing to improve.

Amongst faculty, one said that she is interested in teaching enrichment for self-motivational reasons and to keep her own passion for teaching alive, as well as to share in dialogue with others. Another said he would like to undertake teaching enrichment in order to make a personal connection with his students and in order to learn how to keep students interested in, connected to, and not feel alienated from him or the material. Another just wanted to keep trying to do things better in her teaching. Another wanted to enhance her teaching in order to benefit her students. She added that it was important to her also to enhance her own interest in teaching and to keep her teaching moving forward, otherwise, it could get boring. She also wanted to keep her teaching lively and

interesting for herself as well as for her students. Five of the six faculty members said lack of time was the biggest reason why they are not able to be involved more in teaching enrichment activities. One of these added that another reason is that there is no recognition for teaching improvement as there is for research.

What do you think are or could be the most effective means of assessing the quality of teaching at MUN?

Five of the six administrators thought that a variety of methods should be used in assessing faculty teaching at MUN. Among these five, two suggested a combination of peer assessments and student evaluations, one suggested a combination of self-assessment and student evaluations, another suggested an examination of current and future performance of students and student evaluations, and one suggested a combination of self-assessment, peer assessment, and student evaluations. One said that he thought teaching assessment is a very complex process and could not say what the most effective means would be. On the topic of student evaluations, one of the administrators said:

I support student evaluations but I'm not sure whether it improves teaching in the broadest sense; it improves performance in the classroom in the sense that people become more effective communicators perhaps, and that's good, but I think that there are certain things that come with it that aren't necessarily improving teaching and one of those would be a grade inflation and that doesn't necessarily improve teaching.

On the topic of teaching assessment generally, another administrator said:

A well-rounded form of evaluation that avoids over-reliance on one source of evaluation is crucial; also one that avoids an over-reliance on one aspect of one's teaching. Colleagues might be the best ones to assess whether a faculty member's teaching reflects an up-to-date knowledge of the discipline; students might be the best ones to evaluate whether or not a faculty member is having difficulty. So, a multi-layered system of evaluation would be the most effective in a comparative way, because I think it's a huge mistake to take the results of any evaluation as an absolute value. People too often draw false inferences from the evaluations. But systems of evaluation should bring together different sources of different kinds of evidence to bear on different aspects of teaching.

Among faculty members, all six thought that student evaluations, as they are carried out now at MUN, are *not* an effective means of assessing faculty teaching. One faculty member thought that student evaluations are critical as a *form* of assessment, but that they should be done differently than they now are at MUN. She also thought that there should be faculty self-evaluation, departmental or in-house evaluation, and peer evaluation. She says:

There needs to be an evaluation by the professors themselves of their courses, for their own self-reflection and analysis on their own teaching but also to get to issues of resources. For instance, many professors would probably like to do all sorts of wonderful things but are constrained by resources, financial and other, so I think that's an opportunity for the professor to get back to the administration about their concerns on the delivery of a course in terms of what it is or could be and what it isn't. There should also be more peer sorts of evaluative things going on in formative ways; the faculty in a particular department or school as a whole and each person individually. At the moment I think course evaluations can be used in negative ways as well as positive ways. I would highlight the professor being actively engaged in assessing the course and in tandem with that is the teaching.

Another faculty member thought that the current student evaluation forms (the Student Information Reports) were good but for the lecture format only; it was not a good evaluation for seminar or discussion formats for example. But

she did think that student evaluations were important and that the students were the best ones to ask about teaching quality as they give suggestions and feedback all the time. She thought this was more meaningful than anything superiors can tell a faculty member about his/her teaching. Another was not sure what the most effective means would be; and another thought that although student assessment is an important part of teaching evaluation, there is too much personal interaction between professors and students for them to be effective in the way that they are done now at MUN. Another faculty member said:

Somebody should be doing more work on evaluating the retention of knowledge or the development of skills rather than just relying on surveys for teaching evaluation. There should be some means of doing this in the university; i.e., different parts of the university at different times, and have a facility that can do this for you.

Another was not sure what the most effective means would be. She says:

I think that student evaluations are an important way to gauge teaching. Students' sense of their ability to learn in a course is a real good indicator but it's not the only indicator and sometimes it may not be the most valid indicator; so probably there needs to be a variety of ways to gauge teaching.

Do you think that student assessments of all courses taught at MUN would be useful towards the improvement of teaching? Do you think that they should be mandatory? Why or why not?

Five of the six administrators thought that student assessments should be mandatory (the sixth thought they should not be mandatory for *all* courses, but that they should be mandatory especially for new courses) and are useful, but are useful only to a point: three thought that they should not be the only measure of teaching and one thought that only the students' comments are

useful; the remaining information they provide is too highly interpretive. One administrator says:

I think that they should be mandatory and they might be useful in identifying some very serious problems but overall I'm not sure they would improve the teaching. What they do is improve the university's relationship with its students and that is important.

Another says:

Yes, they are useful but only if the instruments used are well-designed and interpreted with extreme caution. There's an illusion that these can be done by amateurs and there's also a tendency for some people to jump to conclusions with insufficient evidence. They should be required.

All six faculty members said that student assessments *could* be useful but not as they are currently done now at MUN. Three thought they should be mandatory; two thought they should be mandatory *only* if they are improved from the way they are done now at MUN, and one was not sure if they should be mandatory or not. One of the faculty members said that the Student Information Reports that are currently done at MUN are limited and unflexible in that they do not allow for different formats such as seminar teaching and team-taught courses. But she added that they are useful in that they do tell a faculty member where he or she stands in relation to the rest of the faculty, the rest of the university, and the rest of the country. Another said that student assessments could be useful but only if all students were required to complete them, if they were not anonymous, and if an independent body examined them. Another thought that there is too much personal interaction between faculty and students for the current forms to be useful and that the form's design is not adequate. Another said they are not useful as they are done

now and should only be mandatory if proper assessment is developed. Another thought that they are useful only as one indicator of teaching. Another said:

The worry about making student evaluations required is, who gets that information and how is it used? It's one of a variety of ways that you could evaluate the quality of a course or of a professor's teaching but it is not the only way and I don't think it's always necessarily the most valid way either. To make it mandatory, I don't know.

How much time would you estimate that you spend on each of teaching, research, and administrative work? Which of these activities do you think is more important to you in your work? (faculty only)

Four of the six faculty members said that most of their time is taken up with teaching, especially during term time (September to April). One of these four said he spent most of his time on the design of new programs and courses and that this took a lot of work. Another of these added that there is much overlap of time between her teaching and research. Of these four, three said that teaching was the most important activity to them while one said that research was more important. One other said she divided her time fairly evenly between teaching, research and administrative work; of these activities teaching and research are of equal importance to her, and that research underpins all the other activities, especially teaching. Similarly, another said both research and teaching are important to her as well, since she also felt that her research informs her teaching.

How important is the use of technology in teaching?

Five of the six administrators thought technology had a place in university teaching but they differed in the level of importance that they each attached to technology in teaching. Three thought it was extremely important.

Two thought technology was useful but not indispensable; one of these two thought that there are advantages to technology but that it was not a panacea in teaching. All five were fairly specific in their opinions on the value of various kinds of technology and computer software. Two thought that Powerpoint was not a useful package while one thought it provided an important, useful and helpful contribution to teaching. One thought that chalk and blackboard were preferable even to overheads because he thought that the use of overheads led to faculty moving too quickly through course material. One thought that videos, for example, can provide a good visual stimulus. Another thought that presentation of course material is becoming very sophisticated and there is an increasing number of delivery methods that can be used to reach different populations. Four of the administrators thought that the use of the World Wide Web has potential for teaching. Three of these thought that it could greatly improve and change the way courses are offered. For instance, one said that there is a great deal that the Web can do for on-campus courses and distance education, so that it is important for faculty to find out what its capabilities are in order to incorporate it into their teaching. One thought that the World Wide Web can help teaching if the material is clear and rich in content, as well as up-to-date. One of the administrators, who was a strong advocate of the use of technology in teaching, said:

Technology is extremely important. We're in the early years of a revolution that's probably as significant in education as the invention of the printing press. We've only begun to scratch the surface of teaching possibilities, and we've also focused too much on the distance capability of the technology and not on what it can do in the classrooms here. That's what I'd like to see us spend more time on, using it effectively to enhance instruction. This can greatly improve the quality of life for

students who are on-campus. I think we've not even begun to look at the possibilities there, because we've focused too much on the distance capability, which is very exciting too but most of our students are still here on-campus.

Another, who was somewhat less enthusiastic said:

My feeling is that teaching should be good without the technology; technology can enhance it but I think that in some cases over-reliance on technology can abuse the effectiveness of teaching also. So technology can be good or bad; fundamentally the person involved behind the technology has to be good.

Only one faculty member thought that technology was very important in teaching. She elaborated:

I think it's very important as a tool; I'm a little fearful of the overemphasis on it as anything more than a tool or as a mechanism to get at what you need to get at; but it's very important and I spend quite a bit of time professionally developing myself in the area of technology. It's important to value technology in today's culture and society; I think it's important and I try to incorporate it as much as possible and I certainly want my students exposed and literate and functional in current technology as they leave here.

One thought it was important but not necessarily positive. His faculty has "super" classrooms but he feels that people have the misconception that students like technology but he feels that they do not. He thought that technology can be counter-productive if it is not working and being maintained well. Otherwise, he felt it was a hindrance. He says:

I long for the days when I can walk into the low-tech classroom and just throw things onto an overhead projector, which may not be working! It's an important factor; we have not mastered the use of technology. It has not been integrated into my teaching in a way that I feel comfortable and in a way where I feel that it's a production integration.

Another faculty member thought that it was becoming more important all the time. She teaches in a room that has good computer facilities that includes video and an electronic overhead. But she also teaches in rooms that have no

computer facilities in them and she wished they did. She added that she would also like to bring the Web into her teaching but has not done it yet. Another said he did not use technology; the Web was too time-consuming for him to learn. Another thought there was more to be gained from technology. She felt she needed to learn more about how technology can be used. She is currently developing a Web course and thinks it will be an interesting learning experience and it will help her to understand the Web better. The sixth faculty member did not think that technology was very important. She said:

Technology is not terribly important at this point in time. I'm starting my first Web course right now and the jury is still out in terms of how I think it's going. I've got very little feedback from students so far; I really have to wait to see what kind of work they're doing. I really truly prefer face-to-face teaching. I do one correspondence course and I do teleconference with that and I find that without the teleconference I don't think I would bother keeping the course at all because I really don't like that format. And I find the same on the Web; you don't get to see people and meet them face-to-face, so technology I would say is not that important. I don't use videos that much although I do use some. I work with print materials mostly and a piece of chalk; the overhead projector now and then.

Do you think that good teaching and the improvement of teaching depends on the availability and use of technology? If so, what kind(s) of technology do you see as being particularly important for use in university teaching?

Five of the six administrators thought that good teaching and the improvement of teaching does not depend on the availability and use of technology. The sixth said that it did, but only if technology is inherent in the course itself. She added that many courses probably should be "low tech," such as seminar courses where discussion is really important. As to what kinds of technology she would see as important, she said it would depend on the course

and the course material. Another said that technology can only enhance teaching, and then only if it is used properly. He added that it can be effective only if behind the technology there is a good instructor to begin with. One of the administrators said:

There is still nothing better than reading. And I know that many faculty members are spending huge amounts of time putting their courses on a Web site and I think that that is really detrimental. I think that what happens is that students click onto the Web but they're "surfing," not actually learning, and they're not actually assimilating any knowledge and they're not thinking. If they were actually to sit down and read it then they would actually remember reading the article and then have a better chance of remembering. So I'm not overly enamored with technological advances.

Another said:

I could never agree with that. I think that to me good teaching always involves communication between the teacher and the student and that there always has to be a personal communication between the learner and the instructor that has to occur regardless of technology. If the technology enables that communication then it may make teaching more effective but if it comes in the way of that communication then it's going to hurt teaching and probably moreso the learning. We're not saying that good teaching is good learning. Technology may improve learning in some cases but I don't really think it's the same thing as saying good teaching.

This administrator thought that in terms of the kinds of technology that would be useful in teaching, the first priority is the access to the resources themselves. For instance, the availability of resources on-line can improve the material being brought to the course, both in class and outside it. She also thought that videos and powerpoint presentations can help instructors be more organized and sometimes improve the communication between them and their students. Another administrator said:

Not absolutely. Presentation material is good, but it's no good to teach someone how to use the technology if you can't get easy access to equipment.

Another administrator said:

It doesn't depend on it; it can happen anyway. I think the best teachers I ever had didn't use technology. It was the sheer power of their voice and their passion for the subject. And I can wholly imagine teaching very effectively and not being concerned about technology. On the other hand if you go that extra step and take people into a Web site where other people are talking about the subject you're studying I think that does enhance it. So while it's not a necessary condition it certainly couldn't hurt but I wouldn't want to say that excellence in teaching depends on technology, it doesn't, otherwise we'd have to shut our schools.

When asked what kinds of technology were useful in teaching, she responded:

Computer-based stuff obviously; eg. visiting libraries, art museums, etc. of the world; it covers a wide range of stuff; it's that broad. The satellite works really well; The Web has the potential of breaking down national boundaries and I think that's a good thing in education. Canadian content should not be an issue in university; you should have the best content and all the content that you can get. It has that potential.

Five of the six faculty members thought that good teaching and the improvement of teaching did not depend on the availability and use of technology. One thought it did to a certain extent. The responses were quite diverse. One faculty member said:

No. Although we always need some kind of technology; either we're learning about technology or using technology to learn something else. Some of my best teachers were not teachers that relied on technology but in fact were able to focus on the material, make social contact, were able to discern that I was interested and were able to capitalize on that. So, no, I think you can be a good teacher which doesn't depend on the existence of internet connections to the classroom, etc. In fact sometimes because you want to use the technology and feel enthusiastic about it you feel you have to get it in there and it may in fact destroy the message you're trying to send.

When asked what kinds of technology he thought were important in teaching, he said:

I teach Information Systems so we do developmental projects using the technology so I need the technology for that purpose. In terms of the teaching process, the technology I'd like to see to support my activities are flesh and blood technology; having people around to help students through things; provide help centres. Those are people that we need; it's not understood that the use of technology in any undertaking is labour-intensive; people use technology, it does not operate by itself.

Another said:

If you have someone who isn't a good teacher in the first place, no, the technology may even just cause more trouble than it's worth. If you've got someone who's a good teacher in the first place then, yes, you can do a lot, certainly with the computers these days. I don't think anyone can claim that they can teach properly without technology.

When asked what kinds of technology were important in teaching, this same faculty member said that computers were important; in particular, instructors need one in every classroom and students need more access to them than they have now. Another faculty member said:

Indeed not! I've just looked at a computer newsletter from the head of the second-largest software company in the world, saying that the key issue in teaching is the teacher, not the technology. I'm hoping to eventually use the Web simply because of the large classes and to be able to distribute information. But that's not in itself a better way of teaching, it's more of a convenience, a way of saving paper.

Another faculty member said:

Without a doubt, no. The Web is particularly important. It's part of university teaching now whether we like it or not. So I think we should use these media whether or not it improves our teaching. I think we have no idea whether this is going to improve anything. I'm skeptical but I'm open to it. But it's not the medium, it's how it is going to be used. I can see offering a course where part of it is helping students search for information that is the most up-to-date, the most current, but in essence having the information is one thing, knowing how to interpret the information critically and then how to use that information is a

whole other skill and that has nothing to do with the technology, it's about good teaching, so to me that's where it's at.

Another said:

To an extent. It's a reality; it's directly linked to teaching and what good teaching is going to be. Education is going to change drastically. It's going to change definitions of teaching and learning and certainly what good teaching is and whether or not it's an improvement of teaching I don't know. But it's going to change the definition of current understandings of teaching. So therefore I think technology is having a huge impact on education. Web-based instruction is here and in order for it to be further developed, the university is going to have to be a critical partner in making that happen; not only provincially but nationally and internationally. This would be an important centre for that whole medium.

When asked what kinds of technology are important to teaching, this same faculty member said:

I'm personally very much involved with Web-based teaching, certainly for its value as a resource for teachers and students and I think that it should be a normal everyday part of university teaching because it is a normal everyday part of life. Whatever technology is there in our culture and society, it needs to be incorporated into university teaching as one institution of that society. So I think the onus is on the university administrators to facilitate the use of that technology as much as possible, because the instructors may want to do all sorts of things but are very often constrained.

Summary Table 1: Faculty Professional Development in Teaching

Question	Administration	Faculty
What, in your opinion, are the characteristics of good teaching at universities?	enthusiasm, communication skills, commitment to subject, challenging course material, bringing research and experiences to teaching, knowledge of teaching and classroom dynamics, active engagement of students, intuition and sensitivity with students, currency in subject, good attitude, sense of humour.	currency and research brought to teaching, reflection and analysis, excellent organization, relevant and meaningful content, creative and innovative teaching strategies, sound evaluation methods, connections between content/teaching style/approach, active engagement of students, understanding of students' interests and experiences, having students think and reason for themselves, clarity.
Do you think that there are aspects of your own teaching which you would like to change or improve? (faculty only)		2 - courses to be more current; 2 - development of courses for the Web; 2 - be more organized. Generally: improve evaluation skills, develop better resources for teaching, develop different ways of presenting material to students, improve classroom techniques, make course material more relevant to students' interests.
What type of professional development activities related to faculty teaching would you be interested in or would like to see being made available to faculty members at MUN?	3 - peer review or mentoring evaluation system. others - graduate student supervision, integrating information technology into teaching, student evaluation system, professional development resource centre, consultation of faculty members about their needs.	evaluation of students, computer training (including Web course development), enhancing personal interaction with students, enhancing classroom techniques, enhancing learner-centered teaching, activities offered outside of fall/winter semesters, activities for new faculty.
Are you aware of any facilities or activities devoted to the improvement and enrichment of faculty teaching that are currently available at MUN?	4 - professional development workshops (School of Continuing Education), 3 - newsletter: <i>The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial</i> (School of Continuing Education), 2 - graduate student teaching forum, 1 - Arts Computing Centre; 1 - library seminars	5 - professional development workshops (School of Continuing Education); 1 - <i>The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial</i> (School of Continuing Education)

Question	Administration	Faculty
<p>Do you currently involve yourself in any activities having to do with enriching or improving your teaching at MUN? If so, can you describe these activities? If not, would you be interested in taking part in activities devoted to enriching/improving your teaching? (faculty only).</p>		<p>2 - professional development in teaching on their own; e.g. development of courses for Web, readings on evaluation and in <i>The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial</i>; in-faculty group that discusses teaching strategies, and research and teaching. 2 - interested but no time. 2 - interested.</p>
<p>What would you say are the reasons that faculty (you - for faculty) might be interested in pursuing teaching enrichment/improvement activities? What would be the reasons why faculty (you - for faculty) might not be interested or would not be able to get involved in activities devoted to teaching enrichment/improvement?</p>	<p>Interested: 4 - for promotion and tenure for junior faculty; to enjoy and be more effective as teachers for senior faculty. Not interested: 2 - no incentive for senior faculty to improve; 4 - pressures of time; 2 - faculty see enrichment as irrelevant; 1 - do not see teaching as important.</p>	<p>Interested: 1 - self-motivation; 1 - make personal communication with students; 2 - just be better teachers. Not interested: 5 - lack of time; 1 - no recognition for teaching improvement.</p>
<p>What do you think could be the most effective means of assessing the quality of teaching at MUN?</p>	<p>Variety of methods: peer assessment, self-assessment, student evaluation, examination of current and future performance of students.</p>	<p>Student evaluations, self-assessment, peer evaluation</p>

Question	Administration	Faculty
Do you think that student assessments of all courses taught at MUN would be useful towards the improvement of teaching? Do you think that they should be mandatory? Why or why not?	5 - useful and mandatory; 3 - should not be the only method of assessment.	6 - could be useful; 3 - should be mandatory
How important is the use of technology in (your - for faculty) teaching?	5 - technology has a place; 3 - technology very important to teaching; 2 - technology is merely useful to teaching.	3 - technology is very important; 1 - not very important.
Do you think that good teaching and the improvement of teaching depends on the availability and use of technology? If so, what kind(s) of technology do you see as being particularly important for use in university teaching?	5 - technology is not important to good teaching. Important technology: on-line computer aspects; videos; Powerpoint; Web sites.	5 - technology is not important to good teaching. Important technology: human resources who are knowledgeable about technology; access to computers (for faculty and students); 4 - Web access.

Group Two:

- **Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching**
- **University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching**

Do you think that teaching duties and assignments have, in general, increased for faculty at MUN in the last five years?

Two of the six administrators thought that teaching duties had increased significantly within their respective faculties/schools. One of these two thought that class sizes as well as teaching-related duties had increased for faculty members in her faculty. The remaining four administrators thought that teaching duties had not increased. One of these four thought that perhaps some faculty *perceived* their teaching duties to have increased because work assignments in general in her faculty have increased, but that the actual *teaching* duties themselves have not increased. She says:

The average courseload is marginally higher so it hasn't increased greatly. Now the overall assignments probably have; people are doing more kinds of committee work and that kind of thing because our numbers have decreased and so they probably feel the pressure of work and they think that they're teaching more but I don't think in general that's the case.

Five of the six faculty thought that teaching duties have increased very significantly. The one who did not think they had said that teaching duties in her school had been regularized in recent years, so that teaching loads were more equitable and more fair than they used to be. However, this faculty member also said that she hears colleagues from other parts of the university say that they do think that teaching duties have increased. Of the remaining five faculty members, three thought that these increased teaching duties were

due to faculty retirements not being replaced which resulted in remaining faculty taking on extra teaching duties. She says:

We've had such a number of retirements and people leaving and they haven't been replaced, particularly in Arts and Science they're not being replaced at all. And the people who are left are spending a lot more time in the classroom.

Do you think that good teaching is valued and is actively promoted and supported at MUN by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty members?

All six administrators thought that good teaching is valued and actively promoted and supported at MUN by university administration. However, some added some reservations about it. For instance, one thought that it was not promoted to the extent that good research is promoted and supported, since good research is easier to measure and quantify. Another thought that good teaching is simply not promoted and supported very well. Another thought that this administrative support was not perceived by most faculty members. The administrators were evenly split on whether faculty members themselves valued and promoted good teaching amongst themselves. One faculty member thought that research is valued more than teaching to faculty members.

Two of the six faculty members thought that university administration did value, support and promote good teaching but could only speak for their particular situations in their respective schools/faculties; both were not sure if they could say the same for the university administration generally. The remaining four faculty members thought that there was some value, support and promotion of good teaching but that it was minimal or just seemed to be discussed a bit more or did not translate into *real* value; two of these faculty

members said that they thought that research was valued more by the administration. Four of the six faculty members thought that faculty members do not really value good teaching; one said that this was because the faculty members *perceive* that the university administration does not value teaching and that it should be valued by administration more than it is. One faculty member says:

I would say that the messages that I've been getting from university administration are very mixed; there seems to be on the one hand, some lip service to the idea of teaching excellence. On the other hand, when it comes down to promotion and tenure, the big issue is always number of publications.

Do you think the importance of and attention paid to teaching by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty, is increasing at MUN?

Three of the six administrators thought that the university administration was increasing the importance of and attention paid to teaching at MUN. However, one of these three wondered if it was just simply more *visible* than it was before. Of the remaining three, one said that he thought that the administration would like more attention paid to teaching but for a number of reasons research has become more important at the university, so faculty concentrate more on this aspect of their work. Another thought it had increased on the part of administration, but *only* within his faculty; he thought that generally the university administration was *not* stressing the importance of teaching enough. Another administrator was not sure if administration was increasing the importance and attention paid to teaching. One administrator says:

The university administration would like to stress good teaching but I don't think they really have made that a very strict agenda. It's one thing to talk about it but to let people know is important. In very subtle ways the student is a nonentity in terms of the evaluation and any feedback. They talk about teaching and scholarship but they don't talk about comment from the students and expectations and commitment. This is really where the problem starts.

When it came to faculty, two of the six administrators thought that faculty were increasing the importance and attention paid to teaching; one did not. Two others thought that it was not really increasing, that faculty members *always* considered their teaching to be important. Another said it was increasing, but only in his faculty. Another thought that it was not increasing because faculty see that administration values research more, so they concentrate more on research for this reason.

Four of the six faculty members thought that university administration was certainly *talking* more about the importance of good teaching and giving it more visibility, but that this really did not translate into any action or real commitment on their part. One of these did admit that she is seeing more teaching seminars and workshops for faculty being advertised than there used to be; another said there are some real deficiencies in the support being provided for teaching by administration; another thought that good research *and* good teaching must go together and this should be stressed more. Of the two other faculty members, one thought that administrators were paying more attention to teaching in, for example, the promotion and tenure process; the other thought it was increasing but could only speak for the situation in his own faculty.

One of the faculty members said that she thought faculty members were *discussing* teaching more, but were not sure if this really indicated more attention was being paid to teaching. She thought that faculty are not able to spend the time and effort needed to enhance or improve their teaching because of time, workload, resources and other constraints. She says:

I think administration is discussing it but I think, it's sad to say, people's workloads are generally stretched to the limit. I don't know how that translates into actual time taken to deal with issues that come up and time taken for professional development in teaching and time to really reflect on and analyze teaching because of the constraints. Even though I think there is value and attention given to it, I think it's limited in terms of what translates into actual action, particularly action relating to reflection and analysis and therefore change or some sort of improvement. I think it may be a bit static in terms of change and transformation in terms of teaching strategies because of other workload constraints. I think people want to do it; I think they realize the importance of it but may just simply may not have the time and sometimes the resources to deal with it.

Two said that they and their colleagues do consider their teaching very important, but were not sure if this was a campus-wide trend. Another thought that the attention paid to teaching by faculty was increasing because they saw that more attention was being paid to it by administration in the promotion and tenure process. Another thought that it was not increasing on faculty's part.

Do you think that activities devoted to faculty teaching enrichment and improvement are useful and important, and should be made available and be supported at MUN?

Five of the six administrators thought that they were useful and important and should be made available and supported at MUN. One thought that they really were not that useful. She says:

I think faculty generally view themselves as being pretty able and they don't need that sort of thing. With computers, for example, I have found it to be more effective just to have someone in the building who's available to help faculty when they need it, rather than particular activities.

One also thought that that activities should be supported to the same extent that research is. Another says:

I think that they are useful. We can always learn how to do things better and I think that they should be available and supported because if we look at this as primarily an educational institution, an institution of higher learning, then there ought to be some emphasis in terms of quality performance by teachers here.

Another says:

Faculty members cannot expect the university to do everything for them; they have to be self-motivated. If I sense that there is a faculty member who really wants to be a good teacher, I'll support her or him. It might cost money but you'll find it. You get into a situation where faculty members blame the resources for their lack of teaching support. I think that's not true; I think the problem starts from within the person.

Five of the six faculty members thought that these kinds of activities should be made available and supported at MUN. Two of these were glad to see that more professional development activities for faculty are available now than there were a few years ago; they saw this as a positive change. These same two also thought that the university administration should give more recognition to the faculty members who do involve themselves in these activities. Two members also thought it would be useful to make professional development activities available to new or junior faculty members especially. One, however, thought that such activities should be facilitated by someone who has taught before as sometimes they are not. Some of the faculty members' comments:

Faculty should get some credit for doing professional development so that it really actually counts on paper. The MUN administration should recognize this as being a commitment to excellence in teaching. Nobody really cares if they go to them or not except for the people putting them on, but in terms of the administration there's no reward or feedback from your boss that in fact this is a good thing to do; whereas if you publish an article or deliver a conference paper it might get written up in the Gazette or something like that.

Another says:

There isn't enough provided for new faculty particularly; I know from a lot of new faculty who come on here; it's really a sink or swim issue, they jump in and hope for the best.

Another says:

The institution should do its utmost to keep its personnel motivated and current, to help them develop a passion for what they're doing. And these sorts of enrichment activities of various forms and various kinds can only help; not only in the nuts and bolts and in the practical issues that can come from them, but also in helping maintain a passion which for me involves curiosity, and by being exposed to new ideas and people. Then everybody benefits. If there's passion and curiosity and motivation then everybody benefits; nobody loses.

Which do you think is given higher value in promotion and tenure decisions at MUN, research, teaching, or administrative work?

Three of the six administrators thought that research was given the highest value at MUN. One of these three said:

Research. No question. This is why people look at the system and say 'I do research; teaching is ignored by and large so I can get away with it' so they go towards research and students get ignored. Easy.

Another thought that both research and teaching are equally valued in his faculty. He added that a faculty member will not receive promotion or tenure in his faculty if either one is not satisfactory. He said that administrative work does enter into the promotion and tenure process in his faculty, though it is not as important as research and teaching. For example, he said, if administrative

service is weak it can be made up by more research or teaching but if research or teaching is weak it cannot be made up by administrative service. Another said that research is valued the most by the University, but in her faculty, teaching and research are equally weighted. Another said that he could not answer the question; in response, he said:

In promotion and tenure we're looking at biographical information. We're looking at cases where individuals have certain aptitudes and a certain personal history and the tendency is to try to get some sort of individual assessment of what that person has contributed. If they've plainly not contributed in teaching nor research, I don't know many who get promoted because of administrative work. Often, if someone is outstanding in research, that's what gets emphasized; if their greater contribution is in teaching that's what gets emphasized.

Four of the six faculty members thought that research was given higher value. Of these four, one said that substandard teaching gets balanced off with a long research record; another said that in her faculty, faculty members need to be doing research in order for their teaching and graduate supervision to be up-to-date and effective. Two faculty members said that research and teaching have equal weighting in their respective faculties/schools. One of these said:

At promotion and tenure level, teaching is given maybe not higher value but at least equal value. There's some reluctance to give a good finding on a person who has a lot of journal articles but is getting a lot of flack from students and I kind of think that where a person has a really good reputation as a teacher, then the promotion and tenure committees tend to overlook if they're not a really truly productive researcher. But, generally, to the university administration, it's the research that counts.

The other faculty member said:

A teaching record that is poor with high standards of research is not going to cut it but on the other hand a teacher who is a really good teacher but shows absolutely no interest in doing scholarly activity and has no productivity isn't going to cut it either. At our school we really do have a balanced view.

Do you think that the institutional culture at MUN encourages faculty members to pursue professional development activities in teaching? Explain how you think it does or does not.

Two of the six administrators thought that the institutional culture at MUN did not encourage faculty members to pursue professional development in teaching. One thought that it did not do enough, another thought that it did not discourage it. One was not sure if it did or not. She thought that many faculty perceive that the culture does not encourage or support teaching while some others do, so it was mixed. However, she did think that there seemed to be some support and encouragement in that there are professional development activities for faculty that are available and offered to them and she thought this was a positive sign. One administrator said:

I think the institutional culture at MUN is actually low morale at the moment and when you have low morale and you're expected to do more and more with less and less the last thing that that's going to do is encourage faculty members to pursue professional development activities in anything. So with an increased workload, faculty members run out of steam and they just don't have the energy left to go and develop teaching.

Another said:

No. It's the funding and I think that oftentimes the difficulty is that the institution is so large and that the culture is so segmented that things that are offered on one side of the campus or to one faculty are not appropriate or not even considered by other factions of the campus. I think it's just a function of the institutional culture as being large and bureaucratic instead of being distributed and decentralized.

Five of the six faculty members thought that there was very little encouragement and support for professional development for teaching within the institutional culture at MUN. All six thought there was some talk about it and some positive attempts in this direction but no real concrete action. One

thought that the culture is currently not good but perhaps is improving slightly, but not much; she thought that the institutional culture encourages competitiveness amongst faculty rather than cooperation and she thought this was something that needed to be seriously changed. Another said:

I think it's encouraged and discussed, but I don't know what that translates into. They encourage it but on the other hand, I don't think it's valued to the extent that it needs to be in issues related to course evaluation, teacher evaluation, and promotion and tenure. I don't think the appropriate weight or value is given to it at that end to even further encourage or motivate people to do things, and I think that needs to change. I've served on these committees myself and it's just not as highly valued as other forms of research and scholarship, but the awareness is definitely heightened. The discussion is definitely on the up and up and there are some definite steps being put into place but it's not there yet.

What do you think could or would be the most significant benefit to derive from offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching?

Five of the six administrators thought that the most significant benefit would be the improvement of teaching at MUN. One other thought that the most significant benefit would eventually be a more receptive student body that would enjoy learning. He felt that if there was more emphasis on teaching, this might translate into more students becoming interested and motivated in learning, which would in turn help faculty to enjoy teaching their subject more. He said it would give him a lot of pleasure to see the student body be motivated. Another said that next to the improvement of teaching, the most significant benefit would be that it would send a message to faculty and to students that the university considers teaching a professional activity that they want to promote, and that teaching is important. Another thought also

that, next to the improvement of teaching, an institutional culture might be developed and fostered where there might be increased support and encouragement of faculty to pursue their professional development activities; the spin-offs to this, she thought, would be improved teaching and improved faculty-student relations. She thought that if the professional development activities could be coordinated and could meet the needs of faculty, there would be improved teaching and probably also more job satisfaction on the part of many faculty members. One said:

I think that it would improve the standards of the quality of teaching, the self-worth of faculty would go up, there would be higher morale, the university would look good, and I think we'd stop blaming the school systems etc. and just get on with the job. You have what you have and you know how to get there, just get there.

Another said:

Better teaching, that should be what it is. Otherwise why would we do it? But even if you only raise people's interest in and valuing of teaching, then you've accomplished something. That's probably more important in the long term than any particular skill you might teach them in a workshop; letting them know that the institution values teaching. If the institution really valued teaching then you wouldn't be asking these questions; there would be the kind of support for teaching that there is for research. Most people tell you it's not nearly enough to support the research. I'm not so sure about that. I've got to consider if you've got people who only do research and don't do any teaching at all, is that really serving the university's best interest? There can be a close relationship between teaching and research. Intense involvement in research can show in teaching. When that happens it's quite commendable. Not that you have to do original research to be a fine teacher, that's not at all required. You have to be able to read it.

Three of the six faculty members thought that the greatest benefit of offering professional development activities to faculty would go to the students. One added that bad teaching is painful for students, therefore, improved teaching on the part of faculty would benefit the students. One said that the

most significant benefit would be derived from the professional development activities that would help him deal with problems in teaching, and also the exchange of ideas between people at professional development activities. Another said it was the satisfaction in seeing faculty do their job better as well as seeing more satisfied students and effective results. One said:

I'm not sure, but ideally everybody would turn into a perfect teacher, but I'm not sure that's possible. It would be great if we could make them all at least sensitive to the students and willing to answer questions; have them be honestly interested in the students. Many faculty are, but not all.

Another said:

The most significant I would presume would be that we'd improve our ability to engage students in the process of learning. We can't make them learn but we have to engage them so that they will learn for themselves. Anything that we can try to do to foster that is going to improve our outcomes in terms of how students are going to respond to the brave new world. How do we help them manage with all the change that's happening now? We're hardly managing ourselves. But that seems to me to be the most important, engaging them in the process of learning is what it's about.

Another said:

To me the university is all about students and I think the direct benefit would be to students and students are the future. Professional development activities which will enhance teaching, motivate towards currency and reflect one of the university's mandates to work for change, reform, and transformation, and not remain static. Any professional development activity can only aid in the university's goal and in the individual faculty member's goals for that. To me, everyone benefits. But professors remain motivated and up-to-date, therefore, the students get the best of what's out there from happy, satisfied, motivated professors, and then they benefit from that and society benefits from that.

Summary Table 2: Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching

Question	Administration	Faculty
Do you think that teaching duties and assignments have, in general, increased for faculty at MUN in the last five years?	2 - yes; 4 - no	5 - yes; 1 - no
Do you think that good teaching is valued and is actively promoted and supported at MUN by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty members?	6 - by administration - yes; 3 - by faculty - yes; 3 - by faculty - no	4 - by administration - no; 2 - by administration - yes; 4 - by faculty - no; 2 - by faculty - yes
Do you think that the importance of and attention paid to teaching by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty, is increasing at MUN?	3 - by administration - yes; 3 - by administration - no; 4 - by faculty - no; 2 - by faculty - yes	4 - by administration - no; 2 - by administration - yes; 5 - by faculty - no; 1 - by faculty - yes
Do you think that activities devoted to faculty teaching enrichment/improvement are useful and important, and should be made available and be supported at MUN?	5 - yes; 1 - no	5 - yes; 1 - no
Which do you think is given higher value in promotion and tenure decisions at MUN, research or teaching?	3 - research; 2 - teaching and research	4 - research; 2 - teaching and research
How much time would you estimate that you spend (as a percentage) on teaching? On research? On administrative work? Which of these activities do you think is more important to you in your work? (faculty only)		4 - most time taken by: teaching

Question	Administration	Faculty
<p>Do you think that the institutional culture at MUN encourages faculty members to pursue professional development activities in teaching? Explain how you think it does or does not?</p>	<p>4 - no</p>	<p>6 - no</p>
<p>What do you think could or would be the most significant benefit to derive from offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching?</p>	<p>5 - improvement of teaching; 1 - more receptive student body that would enjoy learning. Other: 1 - send message to students and faculty that the university sees teaching as important; 1 - institutional culture might be developed where there is increased support and encouragement of faculty to pursue faculty development activities; 1 - improved teaching and higher morale so that university looks good; 1 - raise people's and institution's interest in and valuing of teaching.</p>	<p>3 - benefits to students; 2 - better teaching and exchange of ideas</p>

V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The preceding chapter presented and analyzed data by examining a variety of documents produced at MUN, the formal incentives currently in place at MUN, and the responses to interviews which were held with a select number of faculty members and administrators of MUN. This chapter highlights and summarizes these individuals' main thoughts and viewpoints which were evident in the study and which emerged from this data.

Faculty Professional Development in Teaching

From the data summarized in Summary Table 1 on pp. 66-7, it is evident from the individuals' responses in this study that, first, there is likely a need for a faculty development centre. Secondly, it can also be seen that there are a variety of ways in which such a centre can be utilized to initiate or expand on activities to assist faculty members in the professional development of their teaching. Such a centre can help to draw faculty involvement and interest in professional development activities in teaching. A faculty development centre can work with faculty members directly in assessing their needs in professional development, and in addressing those needs through the offering of professional development activities. It can also build a sense of community among faculty members, in their attempts to articulate and discuss their professional development needs in teaching.

The areas that are important and which could be useful for the purpose of professional development can be grouped broadly into the areas of teaching effectiveness and teaching strategies, assessment of teaching, and skills development.

In the area of teaching effectiveness and teaching strategies, for instance, these individuals thought that it is important for faculty to be current in teaching, that they try to incorporate creative and innovative teaching strategies, try to engage students and understand their interests and experiences that they bring to the classroom, and try to make teaching more learner-centred.

The individuals also thought that a system of teaching assessment should, in a more formal way, be put in place at MUN. For instance, it was recommended from the document analysis, and from faculty and administration interviews, that a variety of methods should be utilized to assess teaching at MUN: peer-assessment, self-assessment, and student evaluations. The administrators interviewed thought that student evaluations are useful and should be mandatory, while the faculty interviewed thought that student evaluations *could* be useful though should not necessarily be mandatory.

In the area of skills development, it was recommended from the document analysis as well as from the interviews of faculty and administration that more development is desirable in the area of computers and information technology, including the incorporation of the Web into teaching. The

individuals thought that more assistance was also needed by faculty in the preparation of course materials generally.

In looking specifically at the kinds of professional development activities that should be offered to faculty, there were differences between the responses of the administrators and the faculty members. However, taken together, all of the responses of both faculty and administration were also recommended from the document analysis. All those interviewed agreed that workshops in the area of information technology were important and needed. The administrators interviewed would like to see more workshops offered to faculty on how to incorporate teaching assessment strategies such as peer review or a mentoring evaluation system and student evaluations. Some of the other suggestions included workshops on graduate supervision and also the implementation of a consultation process with faculty on their needs in professional development. The faculty members interviewed also wanted to see more workshops on how to incorporate different methods of evaluating student learning in courses and workshops on classroom techniques.

When it came to the awareness of professional development activities currently available at MUN, both faculty and administrators responses' indicated that they were aware of the professional development workshops which are offered on an ongoing basis through the School of Continuing Education. The administrators interviewed were additionally aware of the faculty newsletter *The News About Teaching and Learning at Memorial*. Some of the faculty interviewed indicated that in terms of their own professional development, they read (some also read *The News*) or did other activities on

their own. Few of the faculty members interviewed were actively involved in the professional development activities offered through the School of Continuing Education, partly because of time constraints.

Although the Collective Agreement between Memorial University and the Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association (MUNFA) examined in the document analysis indicated that faculty members have an obligation to develop and enhance their skills and abilities in teaching, the administrators and faculty interviewed recognized that some barriers do exist for faculty which keeps them from engaging in professional development in teaching. Administrators and faculty members did think generally that faculty members would engage in professional development for the purpose of being more effective in their work. But both groups identified time as being one of the biggest reasons why faculty might not be able to engage in professional development.

The most important aspect of offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching is the ability of those who are interested, involved in, and who care about faculty professional development in teaching, to *listen* to faculty members when they voice their concerns about and needs in teaching. Faculty members themselves are the most important resource to be consulted when considering *any* faculty development activities in teaching.

Academic Culture and Encouragement of Faculty Development in Teaching
University Administrative Support for Faculty Development in Teaching

From the data summarized in Summary Table 2 on pp. 81-2, it was evident from the individuals' responses that there were some similarities and differences between the perceptions that the administrators and faculty members interviewed had on these topics. And although the university administrators interviewed seemed to *perceive* that they were doing what they could to promote and offer support for faculty development in teaching, the faculty members themselves who were interviewed did not often perceive this same thing. This was supported together by the documents in the document analysis and the interviews.

More faculty than administrators interviewed perceived that research is given higher priority than teaching in, for example, promotion and tenure. The faculty members interviewed also agreed that most of the time in their work is taken up with teaching; indeed, most indicated that they think that their teaching duties have increased, something which the administrators interviewed did *not* perceive. When it is perceived by the faculty members interviewed, then, that more attention is paid to research even though much of faculty's time is taken up with teaching, it would seem that too little attention is paid to teaching by the administration and that it does not play an important enough role within the institutional culture of the university.

Faculty members interviewed for the study indicated that the teaching activity of faculty's work at the university would likely gain in its profile and

importance if it were evaluated properly and if an effective reward system for teaching was put in place. Although some of the documents analyzed discuss the presence of a reward system at MUN for effective or outstanding teaching, the faculty members interviewed did not perceive that the current reward system adequately rewards good teaching by faculty members.

From the individuals' responses, the presence of a faculty development centre (which is now becoming more visible and is gaining momentum) will likely draw more attention to and expand the importance of the teaching activities of faculty at the university. This will be especially so if faculty *perceives* that the administration of the university *endorses* such a centre and the activities it offers.

Tied in with the institutional culture and administrative support at the university is the finding that administration and faculty interviewed agreed that good teaching was supported and valued by administration but not really by faculty. They also agreed that activities devoted to faculty teaching enrichment and improvement were useful and important and should be made available and supported at MUN. But the two groups did not especially support the idea that either administration or faculty was paying more attention and giving more importance to teaching. Nor did administrators and faculty members interviewed think that the institutional culture at MUN encourages faculty members to pursue professional development in teaching.

Institutional culture and administrative support are also important in addressing faculty's need for enhanced classroom facilities and use of technological aids and equipment in teaching. Both administration and faculty

members interviewed did not think that technology was a crucial element in university teaching, but they acknowledged that it did have an important place in the carrying-out of teaching. One of the documents analyzed specifically recommended that more information technology should be incorporated into the teaching at MUN, but the individuals' responses indicated that faculty often find that the access to and availability of human and other resources related to learning about and incorporating technology into teaching are still lacking. So, although the individuals thought that importance is placed on technology by the university, there are still barriers to faculty incorporating technology into the teaching aspect of their work.

Generally, many of the documents which were analyzed spoke of the university's commitment to, and promotion and support of faculty's efforts to enrich, enhance, and develop their teaching at MUN. But, as mentioned above, the faculty members interviewed do not perceive that this commitment, promotion, and support for teaching is truly visible and present in concrete ways by the university administration and within the institutional culture at MUN.

Throughout the document analysis and the interviews conducted of administration and faculty members at MUN, suggestions are made as to the elements and activities which could or should be put in place in order to encourage and promote the professional development of faculty in teaching at MUN. The final interview question for both groups asks what they think would be the most significant benefit to derive from offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching. The responses revealed how

important and far-reaching these benefits would be. They said: the benefits would be to the students, to the improvement of teaching, that it would send a message that the university sees teaching as important, that an institutional culture would be developed where there is increased support and encouragement of faculty to pursue faculty development, that there would be higher morale, and that it would raise people's and the institution's interest in and valuing of teaching. If the appropriate kinds of developmental activities were made readily available to university teachers, were more visibly and actively supported and promoted by the university administration, and were integrated more clearly into the institutional culture at MUN, these benefits would likely be realized and be transformational for a great number of people: the students, the university community, and the general public.

REFERENCES

- Aleamoni, L. M. (1987). Typical faculty concerns about student evaluation of teaching. In L.M. Aleamoni (Ed.), Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 31, 25-31.
- Allan, G., & Skinner, C. (1991). Handbook for research students in the social sciences. London: The Falmer Press.
- Birenbaum, R. (1991). Teaching tools change university classrooms. University Affairs 33 (March) 3-5.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (1982). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Boice, R. (1992). The new faculty member: supporting and fostering professional development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bonwell, C.C., & Eison, J.A. (1991). Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom. Washington: George Washington University Press.
- Boyer, E.L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching .
- Careless, J. (1992). High-tech success stories. University Affairs 33 (March) 5.
- Cashin, W.E. (1990). Assessing teaching effectiveness. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education. (pp. 89-103). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R.M. (1989). Designing and improving courses and curricula in higher education: A systematic approach. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Doyle, M. (1996). So, you want to learn to use multimedia? University Affairs (December) 11.
- Eberlee, J. (1992). The electronic classroom: A new reality. University Affairs 33 (March) 3-4.
- Eble, K.E., & McKeachie, W.J. (1985). Improving undergraduate education through faculty development: An analysis of effective programs and practices. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Gaff, J.G. (1983). General education today: A critical analysis of controversies, practices, and reforms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gaff, J.G. (1985). Faculty: Ongoing development and renewal. In J.S. Green & A. Levine (Eds.), Opportunity in adversity: How colleges can succeed in hard times. (pp. 137-163). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction. White Plains: Longman.
- Graf, D.L., Albright, M.J., & Wheeler, D.W. (1992). Faculty development's role in improving undergraduate education. In New Directions for Teaching and Learning. 51 San Francisco: Jossey Bass. 101-109.
- Green, J.S., & Levine, A. (1985). Preface. In J.S. Green & A. Levine (Eds.), Opportunity in adversity: How colleges can succeed in hard times (pp. ix-xvi). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hakim, C. (1987). Research design: Strategies and choices in the design of social research. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Hutchings, P. (1994). Peer review of teaching: From idea to prototype. American Association for Higher Education Bulletin 47.3, 3-7.
- Information Technology Plan Phase I Report. (1992) Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Jones, R.A. (1996) Research methods in the social and behavioral sciences. Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates, Inc.
- Lacey, P.A. (1983). The politics of vitalizing teaching. In P.A. Lacey (Ed.), Revitalizing teaching through faculty development. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 15. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 95-105.
- Launch Forth: A Strategic Plan for Memorial University of Newfoundland. (1994). Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- LeCompte, M.D., Millroy, W.L., & Preissle, J. (1992). The handbook of qualitative research in education. San Diego: Academic Press.
- LeCompte, M.D., & Preissle, J. (1993). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Lowman, J. (1984). Mastering the techniques of teaching. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Lunde, J., & Healy, M. (1991). Doing faculty development by committee. Stillwater, OK: Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education and New Forums Press Inc.
- Magnusen, K.O. (1987). Faculty evaluation, performance, and pay: Application and issues. Journal of Higher Education 58.5, 516-529.
- McKeachie, W.J. (1987). Can evaluating instruction improve teaching? In L.M. Aleamoni (Ed.), Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 3-7.
- McManus, K. (1997). The president's award for distinguished teaching. The News about teaching and learning at Memorial. 2.3, 1-2.
- Memorial University of Newfoundland. Collective agreement between Memorial University of Newfoundland and Memorial University of Newfoundland Faculty Association. February 26, 1996-August 31, 1999.
- O'Keefe, M. (1985). Emerging challenges to higher education. In J.S. Green & A. Levine (Eds.), Opportunity in adversity: How colleges can succeed in hard times. (pp. 1-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rice, R.E., & Austin, A.E. (1990). Organizational impacts on faculty morale and motivation to teach. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education. (pp. 23-42). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schuster, J.H., Wheeler, D., and Associates. (1990). Enhancing faculty careers: Strategies for development and renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1990). Academic environments and teaching effectiveness. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education. (pp. 3-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Seldin, P. (1990). Summary and recommendations for academic leaders. In P. Seldin (Ed.), How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education. (pp. 199-213). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skanes, G.R. (1992). Academic development: report prepared for V.P. (Academic). Memorial University of Newfoundland.

- Stevens, J.J. (1987). Using student ratings to improve instruction. In L.M. Aleamoni (Ed.), Techniques for evaluating and improving instruction. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 33-38.
- Svinicki, M.D. (1989). The development of TA's: Preparing for the future while enhancing the present. In A.F. Lucas (Ed.), The department chairperson's role in enhancing college teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 37. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 71-80.
- Svinicki, M.D., & Menges, R.J. (1996). Honoring exemplary teaching. New Directions for Teaching and Learning 65. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Taylor, S.J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). Introduction to qualitative research methods: The search for meanings. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tucker, A. (1992). Chairing the academic department: Leadership among peers. New York: Macmillan.
- Tuinman, J., Keough, K., & Thistle, W. (1998). Final report of the task group on university priorities and resources: Discussion paper on university transformation principles, strategies and priorities.
- Weiler, R.M. (1990). Ideas about improving university teaching: A graduate student's perspective. College Student Journal 23.4. 290-293.
- Weimer, M. (1990). Improving college teaching: Strategies for developing instructional effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yin, R.K. (1989). Case study research: Design and methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A**Interview Questions: Administration/Faculty**

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - ADMINISTRATORS

1. Do you think that teaching duties and assignments have, in general, increased for faculty at MUN in the last five years?
2. Do you think that good teaching is valued and is actively promoted and supported at MUN by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty members?
3. Do you think that the importance of and attention paid to teaching by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty, is increasing at MUN?
4. What, in your opinion, are the characteristics of good teaching at universities?
5. Do you think that activities devoted to faculty teaching enrichment/improvement are useful and important, and should be made available and be supported at MUN?
6. If your answer to no. 5 is generally positive, what type of professional development activities related to faculty teaching would you like to see being made available to faculty members at MUN?
7. Are you aware of any facilities or activities devoted to the improvement and enrichment of faculty teaching that are currently available at MUN?
8. What would you say are the reasons that faculty members might be interested in pursuing teaching enrichment/improvement activities? What would be the reasons why they might not be interested or would not be able to get involved in activities devoted to teaching enrichment/improvement?
9. What do you think are the most effective means of assessing the quality of teaching at MUN?
10. Do you think that student assessments of all courses taught at MUN would be useful towards the improvement of teaching? Do you think that they should be mandatory? Why or why not?
11. Which do you think is given higher value in promotion and tenure decisions at MUN, research, teaching or administrative work?
12. How important do you think is the use of technology in teaching?

13. Do you think that good teaching and the improvement of teaching depends on the availability and use of technology? If so, what kind(s) of technology do you see as being particularly important for use in university teaching?
14. Do you think that the institutional culture at MUN encourages faculty members to pursue professional development activities in teaching? Explain how you think it does or does not.
15. What do you think could or would be the most significant benefit to derive from offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching?

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS - FACULTY

1. Do you think that teaching duties and assignments have, in general, increased for faculty at MUN in the last five years?
2. Do you think that good teaching is valued and is actively promoted and supported at MUN by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty members?
3. Do you think that the importance of and attention paid to teaching by 1) university administration, and by 2) faculty, is increasing at MUN?
4. What, in your opinion, are the characteristics of good teaching at universities?
5. Do you think that there are aspects of your own teaching which you would like to change or improve?
6. Do you think that activities devoted to faculty teaching enrichment/improvement are useful and important, and should be made available and be supported at MUN?
7. If your answer to no. 6 is generally positive, what type of professional development activities related to faculty teaching would you be interested in or would like to see being made available to faculty members at MUN?
8. Are you aware of any facilities or activities devoted to the improvement and enrichment of faculty teaching that are currently available at MUN?
9. Do you currently involve yourself in any activities having to do with enriching or improving your teaching at MUN? If so, can you describe these activities? If not, would you be interested in taking part in activities devoted to enriching/improving your teaching?
10. What would you say are the reasons that you might be interested in pursuing teaching enrichment/improvement activities? What would be the reasons why you might not be interested or would not be able to get involved in activities devoted to teaching enrichment/improvement?
11. What do you think are the most effective means of assessing the quality of teaching at MUN?
12. Do you think that student assessments of all courses taught at MUN would be useful towards the improvement of teaching? Do you think that they should be mandatory? Why or why not.

13. Which do you think is given higher value in promotion and tenure decisions at MUN, research, teaching or administrative work?
14. How much time would you estimate that you spend (as a percentage) on teaching? On research? On administrative work? Which of these activities do you think is more important to you in your work?
15. How important is the use of technology in your teaching?
16. Do you think that good teaching and the improvement of teaching depends on the availability and use of technology? If so, what kind(s) of technology do you see as being particularly important for use in university teaching?
17. Do you think that the institutional culture at MUN encourages faculty members to pursue professional development activities in teaching? Explain how you think it does or does not.
18. What do you think could or would be the most significant benefit to derive from offering professional development activities to faculty in the area of teaching?
19. Can you please provide your academic rank and the number of years you have been at MUN.

Appendix B
Participant Consent Form

Participant Consent Form - Interview

My name is Joyce Joyal and I am a candidate in the Masters of Education Program at Memorial University of Newfoundland. I am currently conducting research into the perceptions and attitudes that faculty and administrators at MUN have about the professional development of MUN faculty in the area of teaching. The purpose of this research is to examine the extent and nature of the academic climate, encouragement, incentives and support at MUN for faculty professional development in teaching, as well as to examine the kinds of professional development activities that are pursued at MUN.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, and you may withdraw your consent to participate at any time. The study will involve a single one-half to one hour audiotaped interview (you will be provided with a copy of the guiding questions for this interview a minimum of three days prior to the interview). This audiotape will be transcribed and neither the tape nor the transcript will be shared with any other individual(s).

The information obtained from the interview will be kept confidential, and it will be coded in such a way that it cannot be associated with the specific responses that you gave in the interview. You will have the opportunity to review the manuscript to ensure that you have not been personally identified and that the correct interpretation has been given to the opinions and comments that you expressed. All tapes and transcripts of the interview will be destroyed when the study has been completed.

The methods that are being used to conduct this research have met the ethical guidelines of the Faculty of Education at Memorial University. Dr. Clar Doyle, of the Faculty of Education (737-7556; 739-6822) and Ms. Marilyn Thompson, Department of Human Resources (737-4627; 782-1811) are acting as my supervisors for this research.

You may make further inquiries regarding the nature of this research from Dr. Linda Phillips, Associate Dean, Graduate Programs and Research, Faculty of Education (737-8587), Memorial University of Newfoundland.

I, _____ (participant) hereby give my consent to participate in "A Study of the Perceptions and Attitudes Towards the Development of Teaching by Faculty at MUN", undertaken by Joyce Joyal. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary, that I can withdraw my consent to participate at any time, that all information is strictly confidential, and that no individual will be identified.

Participant's Signature

Date

Researcher's Signature

Date



