

Making Teaching Count in Canadian Higher Education: Developing a National Agenda

From STLHE Newsletter, No. 21, June 1997

Ronald A. Smith
Centre for Teaching and Learning Services
Concordia University

In this paper I want to make the case that we need to do at least two things to make teaching count in Canadian higher education. The first is to recognize that teaching itself is a scholarly activity. Thus, we need to examine and to develop what Boyer (1990) and Rice (1991) have called the scholarship of teaching. The second is to move towards becoming more professional about teaching in higher education. We need to recognize that holding an advanced degree is not adequate preparation for the role of teacher in higher education. There is special knowledge and skill which must be acquired prior to entering the classroom, either as part of graduate training, or as part of initial professional development on the job. The challenge for Canadian higher education is to focus the attention of the various stakeholders, students and teachers, parents and administrators, business and government on these issues and to develop a national agenda to move us forward. The purpose of this paper is to provide some background for this discussion and to suggest a range of alternatives for consideration. We can do this because we want to, or because we are forced to. But we do need to do it!

Context

Before discussing the scholarship of teaching and the professionalization of teaching, I want to examine some of the different forces which are converging to make this an important and timely topic for consideration. It is not so much that teaching is bad now, or worse than it has been in the past. In fact, we probably don't have data good enough to allow us to make such a comparison. Rather there are changes both inside the academy and outside, in Canada, in the United States, and in the United Kingdom, which clearly indicate that our "business-as-usual" approach to the training of future faculty in graduate schools, to the recognition and reward of teaching in personnel processes, and to the lack of requirements for initial or on-going professional development of faculty as teachers will no longer be adequate

The Smith Report (1991) on higher education in Canada states that "The Commission finds that Canada's universities today are fundamentally healthy and serving the country well. On the whole students, graduates and employers do not seem dissatisfied" (p. 14). Sadly, and paradoxically, he also says that "Teaching is seriously undervalued at Canadian universities and nothing less than a total re-commitment to it is required" (p. 63). How can this be? The undervaluing of teaching cannot be in the best interests of higher education, of our students, or of society.

Across the country, budgets for higher education are being reduced significantly. The response from many is we don't deserve to be treated any differently from the other sectors; it is about time we got our house in order. Underlying these sentiments is the belief that higher education is not delivering on its commitments, particularly in the area of teaching. The conclusion of a recent report prepared for the Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance was that "teaching activities are undersponsored and teaching performance is ineffectively assessed, especially when compared with the research activities of a tenured university professor" (Ormrod, 1996, p. 1). The book by Fairweather (1996), *Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life*, makes the case quite explicitly. There is a crisis of public confidence in professionals; they are seen as being more interested in serving their own interests than in serving the common good (Sullivan, 1995). Rice (1996) describes a serious disconnection between higher education and the larger purposes of society.

For many faculty research is the central mission of the university and necessary to support quality teaching. Some state "It is what distinguishes us from high schools!" On the other hand, Smith (1991) suggests that this is a mistake and that the public support of universities is anchored in their teaching mission: "If university professors are being paid to improve their knowledge and to engage in scholarly

activities, it is primarily so that the teaching they offer to successive generations will be enriched, and only secondarily because society perceives a need for the research findings themselves" (p. 31).

The conclusion of two major surveys of university faculty in the US and Canada, with over 51,000 respondents, is that faculty members, department chairs, and senior administrators say that they support a balance between research and undergraduate teaching; however, each group believes that the others favour research over teaching (Gray, Diamond, and Adam, 1996). In summarizing the comments on these surveys the authors stated:

Clearly many faculty respondents perceived "mixed messages" vis a vis the relative importance of research and undergraduate teaching at their institutions. The phrase "lip service" was the phrase most frequently used to describe the institutional support for teaching . . . few respondents reported having seen what they considered to be tangible evidence of change . . . [in] promotion and tenure and faculty merit decisions, where respondents perceived little follow-through on campus rhetoric about the importance of teaching (p. 21).

The myth of the connection between teaching and research persists in the academy in spite of the strong empirical evidence to the contrary (Terenzini and Pascarella, 1994). In 1994 the Ontario Council on University Affairs published a review of 33 studies which concluded that "while opinions are varied, the evidence accumulated in the literature over the past 25 years is in substantial agreement that there are no necessary links between effective undergraduate teaching and research. Excellent researchers may well be excellent teachers but there is nothing to suggest that one is the prerequisite for the other" (Task Force on Resource Allocation, 1994, p. 2). Hattie and Marsh (1996), after reviewing 58 studies, reached the same conclusion. One consequence of this persistent misperception is that in graduate schools the future faculty receive inadequate preparation for the work they will have to do as teachers. In addition, hiring procedures and efforts to recognize and reward faculty work have focused on research, undervaluing, if not completely ignoring, teaching.

Gibbs (1995), in describing the situation in the United Kingdom stated: "The Higher Education Quality Council . . . reported that not only was there no evidence of progress in this area [rewarding excellent teachers] at the research universities, there was clear evidence of a swing away from emphasizing teaching and towards research as a criterion at new universities, which are normally perceived as emphasizing teaching to a greater extent" (p. 18).

The rhetoric in higher education is that we care about teaching. The mission statements of most universities and colleges proclaim their commitment to quality teaching. Faculty members declare how important it is in annual surveys (Knapper & Rogers, 1994; Paulsen & Feldman, 1995), yet report that it is rarely taken into consideration when important personnel decisions are made. Fairweather (1993) has documented how the research-tilt in the reward system shows up in salaries of faculty in all institutions except community colleges. There is an inverse relationship between the amount of time full-time tenure track faculty spend on teaching and their salaries.

Could it be that so few faculty get rewarded as teachers because there are so few good teachers? In most fields amateurs, even the gifted ones, do not get the same rewards as the professionals. Cross (1990) argues that teaching isn't "treated as a highly intellectual activity because it is practiced at such a primitive level" (p. 3). Building on Levi Strauss's concept of bricolage, Ronkowski (1993) suggests that "because teaching has not been recognized as a form of scholarship, accompanied by appropriate rewards and resources, faculty have traditionally practiced the teaching profession as bricoleurs and inadvertently transmitted this approach to their graduate students" (p. 81). Commenting from a UK perspective, Gibbs (1995), echoes this idea when he suggests that:

Most faculty are simply less sophisticated as teachers than as researchers and even the best are often gifted amateurs rather than rigorous professionals with any knowledge of the literature. Few are able to use theory or any research evidence that what they do works when making teaching decisions. This is not surprising since they have been trained to a much lower level. Even the best TA training in the United States [and I would add Canada] represents a tiny fraction of the master's and PhD research training that postgraduates have undergone. While research standards are maintained by peer review of

research grant proposals and papers, the rejection rate for course outlines or course reviews [if they are even reviewed at all] is probably somewhat lower (p. 19).

Traditionally we have relied on the assumption that new faculty will either be able to teach when they are hired, or will learn how to on the job. Sadly, faculty begin, and continue, to teach without being prepared to do so. Building on the work of Boice (1992) on new faculty, Menges (1994) describes the serious toll this lack of preparation takes on many new faculty who seem to take a "defensive" stance towards their teaching. "They over prepare in order to be sure of getting the content right, and they over lecture in order to be sure of covering the content. They define success as getting good student evaluations and they do what they can to avoid negative evaluations. Under these circumstances, teaching feels frantic, less satisfying, and less intellectually stimulating than they had anticipated" (p. 84).

Even if we could assume that most faculty who stay in higher education eventually learn to teach, at least at an acceptable level, the problem would not be solved because the teaching situation is changing so dramatically (Dolence & Norris, 1995; Gardiner, 1994). The increasing diversity of the student body in terms of who they are, what they know, and how they learn; the demands to prepare students for a changing workplace; the opportunities and challenges presented by the new technologies; together with the expectations of greater "productivity" and increased accountability, require faculty to become much more skilled as teachers (Conference Board of Canada, 1992; Halpern et al., 1994).

In summary, most faculty have little preparation to teach beyond an advanced degree in their discipline. Society is demanding that the universities and colleges recognize the importance of their teaching mission. Exercising this responsibility is becoming more complex because of the changing nature of the student body and the demands of an increasingly information-based and technologically sophisticated workplace (not to mention the expectations in terms of technology of many of the students now coming into higher education). All this is happening in a time of diminishing resources and demands to be more efficient, which usually means teaching more to more students with fewer resources. Will moving towards making teaching count by becoming more scholarly and more professional add even more stress on faculty? Will it become just another burden? I think not! Rather, it should relieve their stress by helping them to become better prepared for the tasks of teaching and by building in recognition and rewards for the work that many say they already value.

I now want to consider two different approaches to moving towards taking teaching more seriously, towards making it count in higher education. One approach has its origins in the US and is reflected in the discussions about the scholarship of teaching. The other has arisen in the UK and is reflected in the discussions about professionalization and accreditation.

Teaching as Scholarly Work

Cross (1986) has suggested that we will not take teaching seriously until we see it as serious intellectual work. Boyer (1990) in *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* has provided a framework for enlarging our conception of what it means to be scholarly. He argues that "the time has come to move beyond the tired old 'teaching versus research' debate and give the familiar and honorable term 'scholarship' a broader, more capacious meaning, one that brings legitimacy to the full scope of academic work" (p.16). At its core the fundamental work of faculty in their "academic and civic mandates" is to be scholarly: to advance knowledge in their field through the scholarship of discovery; to integrate knowledge through the structuring of the curriculum through the scholarship of integration; to transform knowledge through the challenging intellectual work involved in teaching and facilitating learning through the scholarship of teaching; and to apply knowledge to the compelling problems in their community through the scholarship of practice.

Shulman (1995) suggests that the scholarship of discovery asks what do we know and what warrants do we have to support our claims to knowledge. The scholarship of integration asks what does this knowledge mean, how does it connect to other things we know. The scholarship of application asks what can we do with what we know. The scholarship of teaching asks how can we communicate it to others; how can we transform what we know so that others can come to understand it. He argues that the scholarship of teaching builds on and includes the other scholarships. Beyond knowing the content, Rice (1991) has indicated that the scholarship of teaching requires pedagogical content knowledge

(knowledge of the interaction between the learning process and the content, expertise in helping students integrate new knowledge into their existing schemes) and knowledge of student meaning making (recognition of the diversity of student learning characteristics, and stages of student cognition).

I am not suggesting here that these different forms of scholarship should be ranked; although in the academy research, understood as the scholarship of discovery, seems to have the place of honour. Rather the intent of this new vision of scholarship is that all faculty, in all aspects of their work, should be able to "see themselves as scholars engaged in intellectual tasks and doing it with dignity" (Rice, 1996, p. 18).

Why isn't teaching valued as scholarly work? Shulman (1993) has argued that "It is not that universities diminish the importance of teaching because they devalue the act itself; it is not that research is seen as having more intrinsic value than teaching" (p. 6). Rather, it is that we treat teaching in a way which removes it from the "community of scholars." He concludes that "if we wish to see greater recognition and reward attached to teaching we must change the status of teaching from private to community property" (p.6). If our image is of a community of scholars and scholarship, then for teaching to become scholarly, it must become part of our conversation. Palmer (1993) captures the essence of both the problem and its solution:

Faculty, unlike many other professionals, lack the continuing conversation with colleagues that could help us grow more fully into the demands of the teacher's craft. No surgeon can do her work without being observed by others who know what she is doing, without participating in ground-round discussions of the patients she and her colleagues are treating. No trial lawyer can litigate without being observed and challenged by people who know the law. But teachers conduct their practice as teachers in private . . . by privatizing teaching we make it impossible for the academy to become more adept at its teaching mission. The growth of any skill depends heavily on honest conversation among those who are doing it (p. 8).

Shulman (1993) has offered three strategies for moving beyond our pedagogical solitude towards creating a community which could build the type of scholarship of teaching described by Boyer and Rice. First, we need to (re)connect teaching to the disciplines. The disciplines (or departments) are the basis for our intellectual communities. If teaching is a form of scholarship, if it is to be seen as intellectual work in the disciplines, it is going to be more valued than non-disciplinary work. In most universities the improvement of teaching is university-wide and non departmental. Often the result is that teaching is seen as general, generic, and technical, merely a matter of performance. It is something outside of what we really do as scholars in our disciplines.

Second, we must make teaching visible through the use of artifacts which can capture its richness and complexity. The teaching dossier, or portfolio, developed by the Canadian Association of University Teachers (Shore et al., 1980, 1986) represents a major Canadian contribution to developments in this area (Edgerton et al., 1991; Seldin (1996); O'Neil & Wright, 1993; Smith, 1995a). This concept is now being expanded to the idea of a course portfolio (Cerbin, 1995).

Third, the work of teaching must be seen as something whose value we have an obligation to peer review; that is, to judge within our disciplinary communities. We need to make the review and examination, as well as the support of the scholarship of teaching, part of the responsibilities of the disciplinary community, in the same way that we do with the papers, grant proposals, etc. associated with the scholarship of discovery. Shulman (1993) sets a high standard for the evaluation of teaching: ". . . the very procedures we employ [should] raise the likelihood that teaching gets treated seriously, systematically, and as central to the lives of individual faculty and institutions . . . [and] to use procedures from which the faculty are likely to learn to teach better" (p. 7).

Several projects have been initiated to move these ideas forward. One is the peer review of teaching project which is represented in the AAHE publications *From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching: A Project Workbook* (Hutchings, 1995) and *Making Teaching Community Property* (Hutchings, 1996). These monographs describe the results of a project to explore alternative ways to portray our work as teachers and suggest ways to structure conversations among peers, our disciplinary colleagues, about this work.

If we are to talk of teaching as scholarly work then the professional associations must be involved. Many (US based) scholarly associations are working to redefine scholarship to reflect Boyer's enlarged conceptions, including the scholarship of teaching. Some of this work is reported in *The Disciplines Speak* (Diamond & Adam, 1996). The disciplinary associations, for example, mathematics (Case, 1994), are also working to develop materials to prepare teachers.

One method of communication within the community of scholars is through journals. There are "approximately 50 discipline specific journals devoted exclusively, mostly, or occasionally to matters of pedagogy" (Weimer, 1993). Of those, only 14 are devoted exclusively to college level teaching. Unfortunately, "these pedagogical periodicals are viewed as weak siblings of the favored and prestigious research journals . . . When asked about these journals on teaching, what faculty tend to say first is that publication in them 'doesn't count,' that writing about pedagogy isn't regarded as legitimate scholarship" (Weimer, p. 44).

There is more to the scholarship of teaching than publishing! Yet sadly, even when articles on teaching are published in peer reviewed journals, the work is discounted. If we are to think of teaching as scholarly work, and to value it as scholarship in its own right, we need to develop a much better understanding of what this might mean, as well as to develop ways to assess it. If we are to follow the models we use for the scholarship of discovery, namely peer review, we need to develop in the faculty members, starting at the departmental level, the knowledge, skill and commitment to engage in the task. (Smith, 1995a.)

At the time of his death, Boyer was working on *Scholarship Assessed*, the necessary companion to his enlarged definition of scholarship. If there are other forms of scholarship beyond the traditional discovery research, with its already well developed peer review processes for grants and publications, how will these other forms of scholarship be assessed? Traditional scholarship is public and shared. It is extrinsically as well as intrinsically rewarding. It is part of a community of discourse that is directly connected to our intellectual life and to our expertise. Traditional scholarly achievements are documented and made available to others, recognized and rewarded by our peers. These ideas need to be applied to the other forms of scholarship (Rice, 1996). The Peer Review of Teaching Project mentioned earlier is a good example of one effort in this direction.

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching is about to release *Scholarship Assessed*. Boyer (1994) suggested that faculty evaluation should focus on the professional characteristics of the scholar, such as honesty, persistence, and courage. We need to develop standards of faculty performance which we agree upon, where the evidence of a scholar's research, teaching, and outside activities is "broad and rich and varied," including self-evaluation, peer review, and student opinion. Faculty members must have confidence in the evaluation process. Some of the general principles that should inform the assessment of any work as being scholarly include that it reflects a thorough knowledge of the field, has clear goals and purpose, uses appropriate methods and procedures, uses the right resources in an effective and creative way, exhibits good communication and quality of expression, and produces significant results.

In summary, there seem to be two parallel streams moving along the scholarship route. One is focussed on developing ways to represent our work as teachers and to experiment with different ways to talk with colleagues about our teaching. The fundamental concept is that we need to move beyond our pedagogical solitude to create spaces where we can talk about our teaching and through these conversations begin to build the scholarship of teaching. The second path involves the disciplinary associations in renewing and elaborating broader conceptions of scholarly work and its assessment.

If we consider teaching as scholarly work, how does one acquire the special knowledge and skills required to practice this scholarship? I now turn to another approach to making teaching count which has its origins primarily in the United Kingdom, namely, teaching as a professional activity.

Teaching as a Professional Activity

In higher education we have moved towards more professionalization within the disciplines. This has been promoted and facilitated by the increasingly narrow research focus of graduate education.

However, when PhDs who have been very well trained as researchers enter the academy, they often find that their main job is teaching undergraduates, a task for which they are almost totally unprepared. Unlike doctors, lawyers, and many other professionals, most university professors practice on their clients without the benefit of any formal training in teaching. What would it mean to be more professional about university teaching? What does one need to add to the concept of a mathematician (or historian, or etc.) in order to have a teacher of mathematics (or history, or etc.)? One characteristic that should be required of university teachers as professionals is that they retain theoretical knowledge on which to base their activities. This body of knowledge is more than a series of techniques and rules. It is an ordered pattern of ideas and evidence that a professional uses in order to decide an appropriate course of action from many possible choices. The professional authority of the academic-as-scholar rests on a body of knowledge; the professional authority of the academic-as-teacher should rest on a body of didactic knowledge. This comprises knowledge of how the subject he or she professes is best learned and taught . . . the key to improving teaching is changing the way in which the process of education is conceived by its practitioners (Ramsden, 1992; p. 9).

The Association of University Teachers (1996) in the United Kingdom in Professional Accreditation of University Teachers, has described the current context for their discussion of these ideas and the pressures on them to develop qualifications and standards, to move towards becoming more professional about teaching. Closely related to broad concerns about accountability and quality assurance, "There is [UK] government and European Union commitment to the development of a national framework of vocational and professional qualifications that will eventually cover everyone in employment [including professors] . . . Others will put this issue on the agenda if we do not. Either the profession itself grapples with these complex and difficult questions of qualifications and standards, or some system, appropriate or otherwise will be imposed from the outside" (AUT, p. i).

One of the ways that teaching is unlike other professions is that it does not have a professional board to administer issues of professional ethics. STLHE has recently published *Ethical Principles in University Teaching* by Murray, Gillese, Lennon, Mercer, and Robinson (1996). This document articulates "a set of basic ethical principles that define the professional responsibilities of university teachers in their role as teachers." This is one of the first documents of its type to be widely circulated in Canada.

The first ethical principle is "content competence." The training of graduate students in PhD programmes is designed to ensure that future faculty have acquired a "high level of subject matter knowledge" to begin their careers. Sabbaticals and ongoing research projects are designed to ensure that faculty maintain that level and that "course content is current, accurate, representative and appropriate."

The second ethical principle is "pedagogical competence" which states that a "pedagogically competent teacher communicates the objectives of the course to students, is aware of alternative instructional methods or strategies, and selects methods of instruction that, according to research evidence (including personal or self-reflective research) are effective in helping students to achieve the course objectives." Where in the graduate preparation of future faculty, or during their careers as professors do individuals acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to be pedagogically competent?

Scriven (1988) has identified four general dimensions of competence and excellence in teaching. They are: "Quality in the content of what is taught and what is learned; Quantity in the amount of learning that is imparted; [and] Ethics and Professionalism in the process" (p. 320). He describes the central responsibility of a professional as ". . . the obligation to determine in an objective manner whether or not they are successful (the obligation to self-evaluation as a starting point for self-improvement) . . . [It] almost always will involve obtaining expert external evaluation, since one can hardly be regarded as an objective judge of one's own merit" (p. 322-323).

This obligation to self-evaluation requires an assessment of how successful we are in achieving these goals. It is the amount of valuable learning we produce that counts, as long as we don't "cheat." Scriven argues that one indication of our lack of professionalism with respect to teaching is that we have become careless in our evaluation of teaching. We often measure the style of teaching instead of measuring student learning. We have even become careless about checking for cheating (e.g., the

teaching of material that is inaccurate or trivial) and treat all other duties (e.g., advising, curriculum development, etc.) as minor, which is certainly not true if they are taken collectively.

One standard of a professional practice is that it is founded on a special body of knowledge. Is there enough known about teaching and learning in higher education to establish this foundation for university teaching? AUT (1996) declared that there "is now a large body of well-researched literature on all aspects of higher education. We know much more, for example, about how students learn, and about teaching techniques that are most effective in different circumstances. It is now reasonably well accepted that teaching techniques can be taught; that a knowledge of educational theory can be used to inform and improve teaching practice; and that teaching effectiveness can be assessed and methods of proven success reproduced and refined" (p. iii). If one accepts this, then their conclusion that the current "ad hoc approach is no longer acceptable" seems obvious.

The Staff and Educational Development Association (SEDA) in the UK has developed a system for assuring that training programmes for university teachers meet certain standards. These programmes are externally examined and moderated. Teachers completing approved programmes qualify for accreditation. SEDA's standards (see sidebar) are special because they have been accepted as the basis for required training of new faculty in 40 institutions.

The Association of University Teachers (AUT) has raised a number of concerns about any programme of accreditation. Who has access to the programme and will the resources necessary to support it be available? Will the programme be sensitive and flexible to different career stages or paths, and to disciplines? Will it be seen as desirable and recognized in salary? Will it be portable across institutions? Will voluntary accreditation lead to compulsory qualifications? Should accreditation include a requirement to maintain knowledge and update skills? Who will control the system and how will accountability be ensured?

In contrast to the initiatives in the UK, programmes in North America have focused on graduate school and the training of teaching assistants (TAs). Because so much teaching is being done by TAs, well organized training programs have developed at many universities in Canada and in the US. Four national US conferences on the training of TAs have been held. The "Preparing Future Faculty" (PFF) project (Gaff & Lambert, 1996; Pruitt, 1995), developed by the US Council of Graduate Schools, expands on the work already being done in the training of TAs. It adds the dimension of providing graduate students with the opportunity to teach in other sectors such as liberal arts and community colleges, as well as to have some experiences in the governance aspects of higher education. The key idea behind this project is that most PhDs will not teach in universities like the ones from which they graduate. Thus, they need to be better prepared to work in other settings.

Gibbs (1996) has identified some of the major issues which must be considered in developing programmes for preparing university teachers. What is the appropriate scale? At one end there is the typical TA training programme, usually of 3 to 10 hours; at the other end the 200-300 hours of the SEDA programme. There are issues of comprehensiveness: Who should take these programmes? TAs? New hires? What should they include? Classroom teaching? Other responsibilities? Should they be compulsory or voluntary? There are issues of standards: What level of competence should be required? Who should decide? Should these programmes be credit bearing? Should the orientation of these programmes be towards classroom practice and technical skills, the practical demands of the job, or towards educational theory, reflective practice, personal growth and mentoring? Should the focus be on improving current practice or transforming it, towards solving yesterday's problems or tomorrow's?

In summary, there have been significant pressures to move towards becoming more professional about teaching. In North America the general response has been to improve the training of TAs or to add an elective course or two to the graduate curriculum. In the UK, the response has been to develop a set of procedures for accrediting programs, the successful completion of which would lead to accreditation of the teacher.

The Canadian Situation

There have been two general responses to the pressures on higher education to move towards making teaching count. One has been built around the idea of enlarging the concept of scholarship to include teaching as scholarly work. The second response has been built around the idea of teaching as a professional activity requiring special knowledge and skills. What are we currently doing in Canada with respect to these pressures on higher education? The response can be divided into before and after hiring. The chart below presents one way of thinking about the various stages of an academic career and what might be done. What are we doing in graduate schools to prepare for faculty members for their role as teacher? What are we doing after we hire faculty to develop and maintain their knowledge and skills as teachers? Of course the hiring process itself can be a critical first step in beginning to develop scholarly conversations about teaching; for example, the pedagogical colloquium (Hutchings, 1996).

Graduate School

Most graduate schools in Canada offer courses on university teaching which can be taken as part of regular programmes of study. Piccinin & Picard (1994) and Smith & Brown (1995) have reviewed these courses. In general, they are only three-credit courses. Their contents are varied and often reflect the orientations of the departments or individuals offering the course. It seems clear that no matter how comprehensive, or how well taught, one three-credit course is inadequate preparation for a career as a teacher. Smith & Brown (1995) concluded that most of these courses did not (nor could they be expected to) cover even a small section of the list of SEDA goals and objectives, much less help the participants achieve competence. This preparation is clearly not enough. What else needs to be done? By whom?

Three universities (Manitoba, New Brunswick, and York) have moved beyond the single course to establish more intensive "certificate" or "diploma" programs in university teaching. These programmes need to be described and analysed in terms of content, student activities, implicit and explicit theories of being a university teacher, student achievement, etc. They also need to be assessed in terms of their potential to produce "graduates" who could meet the SEDA standards. This is not to declare SEDA as the "gold standard," but rather to suggest that it represents one benchmark against which we might measure ourselves. Of course, the benchmark also needs to be assessed! By whom?

Most universities offer support for their TAs in terms of orientation sessions and workshop series. Programmes range in length from 3 hours to 3 weeks. In some cases they are required; in others, optional. Although general descriptions of these programmes are readily available in the STLHE Directory of Canadian Instructional Development Units and Teaching and Learning Committees, there are few studies of their effectiveness (Piccinin, Farquharson, & Mihi, 1993). Comparisons should be made with other programmes, for example, in the US. Information on US programmes is available in the conference proceedings of the four national T A conferences, and in *Preparing Graduate Students to Teach: A Guide to Programs that Improve Undergraduate Education and Develop Tomorrow's Faculty* (Lambert & Tice, 1993). Again, this information can provide benchmarking data for assessing Canadian practice. However, while they may be helpful to novice TAs by providing basic survival skills and building confidence, these programmes, as well as the single course on university teaching and the "certificate" and "diploma," cannot be considered as adequate preparation for a career as a university teacher!

After Hiring

I am not aware of any university in Canada which offers a programme similar in length and focus to the SEDA programmes. What do we do? While there are descriptive studies of the types of faculty development programmes offered in Canada (Donald, 1986; Konrad 1983), I'm not aware of any comprehensive study of the range, type, and impact of programmes offered to new hires in Canada during their first two years, or to faculty as an on-going part of their professional development. Again, the STLHE Directory of Canadian Instructional Development Units and Teaching and Learning Committees provides a starting point for describing what is happening in centres across Canada, but much more detailed information is needed about the programmes' content, participants, follow-up, and impact. The general components of programmes include: new faculty orientation; special workshops, seminars, and courses; mentoring; mid-course feedback; teaching consulting; grants for instructional development projects; resources and information (newsletters). Are there others? These programmes are generally

offered on a voluntary basis. Are they adequate preparation for a professional and scholarly career as a teacher?

Where do we go from here?

If we are to make teaching count in Canadian Higher Education, if we are to take teaching seriously, then the concerted efforts of the entire system will be required. What is envisaged here is a major cultural shift (Smith, 1995b) in the academy which will require action on the part of all the stakeholders in higher education. It will require patience and perseverance, commitment and cooperation. Who should act and what should they do? What suggestions, challenges, recommendations do you have to offer to each of these groups: graduate schools, administrators, chairs, individual faculty members, faculty unions and associations, student associations, governmental agencies, and business groups.

You are invited to comment on what is currently being done in Canada, what you think should be done, and who you think should do it. Please send your comments, suggestions, and recommendations to the author at rasmith@vax2.concordia.ca or to the editor at progers@edu.yorku.ca.

References

- Association of University Teachers (1996). "Professional Accreditation of University Teaching," Supplement to AUT Bulletin, January, London.
- Boice, R. (1992) *The New Faculty Member*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Boyer, E. (1994) From a talk at AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards, New Orleans, January, 1994. Reported in *The Chronicle*, February 9, 1994, p. A22.
- Boyer, E. (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*. Princeton: NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Case, B.A. (Ed.) (1994) *You're the Professor: WHAT NEXT? Ideas and Resources for Preparing College Faculty*. MAA Notes No. 35. The Mathematical Association of America.
- Cerbin, W. (1995) "Connecting Assessment of Learning to Improvement of Teaching Through the Course Portfolio," *Assessment Update*, 7(1), January-February, pp. 4-6.
- Conference Board of Canada. (1992) *Employability Skills Profile: What Are Employers Looking For?* Ottawa, ON: Conference Board of Canada.
- Cross, K.P. (1990) "Teachers as Scholars," *AAHE Bulletin*, 43(4), December, pp. 3-5.
- Cross, K.P. (1986) "A Proposal to Improve Teaching, or What 'Taking Teaching Seriously' Should Mean." *AAHE Bulletin*, 38(1), pp. 9-14.
- Diamond, R.M. & Adam, B.E. (1996) *The Disciplines Speak: Rewarding the Scholarly, Professional, and Creative Work of Faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Dolence, M.G. & Norris, D.M. (1995) *Transforming Higher Education: A Vision for Learning in the 21st Century*. Ann Arbor, MI: Society for College and University Planning.
- Donald, J.G. (1986) *An inventory of programs, courses and other kinds of pedagogical training of Higher Education personnel in Canada: A report to the European Centre for Higher Education*. Montreal: Centre for Learning and Development, McGill University.
- Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P. & Quinlan, K. (1991) *The Teaching Portfolio: Capturing the Scholarship of Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.

- Fairweather, J.S. (1996) *Faculty Work and Public Trust: Restoring the Value of Teaching and Public Service in American Academic Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Fairweather, J.S. (1993) *Teaching, Research, and Faculty Rewards*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University, National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment.
- Gaff, J.G. & Lambert, L.M. (1996) "Socializing Future Faculty to the Values of Undergraduate Education," *Change*, July/August, pp. 38-45.
- Gardiner, L.F. (1994) *Redesigning Higher Education: Producing Dramatic Gains in Student Learning*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, DC: Graduate School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.
- Gibbs, G. (1996) "Preparing University Teachers: An International Overview of Practice and Issues." Paper presentation, conference on Improving University Teaching, Nottingham University, UK, July 22-25.
- Gibbs, G. (1995) "Promoting Excellent Teaching Is Harder Than you Think: A Note From an Outside Observer of the Roles and Rewards Initiative," *Change*, May/June, pp. 17-20.
- Gray, P.J., Diamond, R.M., & Adam B.E. (1996) *A National Study on the Relative Importance of Research and Undergraduate Teaching at Colleges and Universities*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University, Center for Instructional Development.
- Halpern, D.F. et al. (1994) *Changing College Classrooms: New Teaching and Learning Strategies for an Increasingly Complex World*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Hattie, J. & Marsh, H.W. (1996) "The Relationship between Research and Teaching: A Meta-Analysis," *Review of Educational Research*, 66(4), pp 507-542.
- Hutchings, P. (1996) *Making Teaching Community Property: A Menu for Peer Collaboration and Peer Review*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Hutchings, P. (1995) *From Idea to Prototype: The Peer Review of Teaching: A Project Workbook*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Knapper, C.K & Rogers, P.K. (1994) *Increasing the Emphasis on Teaching in Ontario Universities*, contributed paper, Task Force on Resource Allocation. Toronto, ON: Ontario Council on University Affairs.
- Konrad, A G. (1983) "Faculty development practices in Canadian Universities," *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XIII(2), pp. 13-25.
- Lambert, L.M. & Tice, S.L. (Eds.) (1993) *Preparing graduate students to teach: A guide to programs that improve undergraduate education and develop tomorrow's faculty*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Menges, R. J. (1994) "Preparing New Faculty for the Future," *Thought and Action*, 10(2), pp. 81-95.
- Murray, H., Gillese, E., Lennon, M., Mercer, P., & Robinson, M. (1996) *Ethical Principles in University Teaching*. North York, ON: Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education.
- O'Neil, C. & Wright, A. (1993) *Recording Teaching Accomplishment: A Dalhousie Guide to the Teaching Dossier (4th ed.)*. Halifax, NS: Dalhousie University, Office of Instructional Development and Technology.
- Ornrod, J. (1996) *Tenure, Teaching Quality, and Accountability*. Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance.

- Palmer, P. (1993) "Good Talk About Good Teaching: Improving Teaching through Conversation and Community," *Change*, November/December, pp. 8-13.
- Paulsen, M.B. & Feldman, K.A. (1995) *Taking Teaching Seriously: Meeting the Challenge of Instructional Improvement*, ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University.
- Piccinin S.J., Farquharson, A, & Mihi, E. (1993) "Teaching Assistants in Canadian Universities: An Unknown Resource," *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXIII(2), pp 104-117.
- Piccinin, S. & Picard, M. (1994) "Credit Courses on University Teaching for Graduate Students in Canadian Universities," *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*, XXIV(3), pp 58-70.
- Pruitt, A.S. (1995) "Preparing Future Faculty: Frequently Asked Questions," *CGS Communicator*, pp. 10-12. Washington, DC: Council of Graduate Schools.
- Ramsden, P. (1992) *Learning to Teach in Higher Education*. London: Routledge.
- Rice, R.E. (1996) "Making a Place for the New American Scholar," Draft paper for discussion at AAHE Conference on Roles and Rewards, Atlanta, GA.
- Rice, R.E. (1991) "The New American Scholar: Scholarship and the Purposes of the University," *Metropolitan Universities: An International Forum*, 1(4), pp. 7-18.
- Ronkowski, S.A. (1993) "Scholarly Teaching: Development Stages of Pedagogical Scholarship," *Preparing Faculty for the New Conceptions of Scholarship*. L. Richlin (Ed.). *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, No. 54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scriven, M. (1988) "Duty-Based Teacher Evaluation," *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 1, pp. 319-334.
- Seldin, P. (1996) *The Teaching Portfolio: A Practical Guide to Improved Performance and Performance/Tenure Decisions* (2nd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing.
- Shore, B.M., Foster, S.F., Knapper, C.K, Nadeau, G.G., Neil, N., & Sim, V. (1980) (Revised edition, 1986) *Guide to the Teaching Dossier: Its Preparation and Use*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of University Teachers.
- Shulman, L.S. (1995) "The Anatomy of a Course." Talk at AAHE Roles and Rewards Conference, Atlanta, GA.
- Shulman, L.S. (1993) "Teaching as Community Property," *Change*, November/December, pp. 6,7.
- Smith, R.A. (1995a) "Creating a Culture of Teaching Through the Teaching Portfolio," *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 6(1), pp. 75-99.
- Smith, R.A. (1995b) "Reflecting Critically on Our Efforts to Improve Teaching and Learning," in E. Neal (Ed.), *To Improve the Academy*, 14, pp. 5-25.
- Smith, R.A. & Brown, S. (1995) "Preparing To Teach in Higher Education," *Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education*, Montreal, QC.
- Smith, S.L. (1991) *Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Canadian University Education*. Ottawa, ON: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Sullivan, W.M. (1995) *Work and Integrity: the Crisis and Promise of Professionalism in America*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Task Force on Resource Allocation. (1994) Undergraduate Teaching, Research, and Consulting/community Service: What are the Functional Interactions? A Literature Survey. Toronto, ON: Ontario Council on University Affairs.

Terenzini P.T. & Pascarella, E.T. (1994) "Living with Myths: Undergraduate Education in America," *Change*, January/February, pp. 28-32.

Weimer, M. (1993) "The Disciplinary Journals on Pedagogy," *Change*, November/December, pp. 44-51.