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Introduction

This is a literature review for Stage 1 of the Australian Learning & Teaching Council’s Project, Preparing University Teachers: A Model for National Collaboration. It is anticipated that where necessary literature reviews will accompany each of the subsequent phases of the project. The project’s aim is to “improve the student learning experience through improvement in the preparation of university teachers” (Gannaway et al., 2007). This review sought to identify and analyse literature which identified and considered ‘good practice’ methods in preparing new academic staff for their teaching role. Whilst the literature review is extensive it is not exhaustive.

Method

The PATHE website\(^1\) indicates that many higher education institutions provide support to academic staff through structured programs enabling them to develop effective teaching and design of educational programs (Staff Development and Training Unit Flinders University, 2003). Initially documents supporting this claim were found using the library databases of Flinders University, University of South Australia and Google Scholar. Conducted from a worldwide perspective these searches focussed on resources published since 2000 to ensure the discussions were current. Only those documents which considered programs for new staff were included in the literature review.

\(^1\) The PATHE website hosted by Flinders University was established to help institutions who develop and organise Foundations of University Teaching programs to network and collaborate.
Predominately comprising of journal articles the literature reviewed also included particularly relevant government reports and book chapters. Since university websites had already been identified and are available for exploration via the PATHE website they were not included. Whilst special consideration was given to acquiring literature from a broad range of countries, little was found in relation to programs from countries beyond Australia and the United Kingdom (UK).

One Australian report, *Investigation into the provision of professional development for university teaching in Australia: A discussion paper* by Dearn, Fraser & Ryan (2002) and published by the Department of Education Science and Technology (DEST), was identified as being particularly relevant. Whilst most other resources focussed predominantly on single issues this particular report covered the whole gamut of issues raised. The main issues identified across this literature are:

- causal factors (e.g. perceived importance of initial teacher development programs; teaching professionalism including the quality agenda and accreditation);
- different types of programs and courses (induction, mentoring programs, teaching assistant programs and short courses and post graduate certificates);
- teaching models and methods;
- course and program evaluation and
- potential problems (competition between teaching and research, willingness to participate in programs and departmental cultures).

Rather than following literature review convention by addressing the most prominent issue first, topics have been presented in a way that appeared logical to the authors. The section on causal factors is followed by details about programs and courses and discusses the teaching models and methods they include. This in turn is followed by how the various aspects may be evaluated and a brief description of issues that may potentially interfere with the success of programs precedes the conclusion.
Causal factors

In a rapidly changing world escalating pressure has been put on universities to review many aspects of higher education including concepts of teaching practices and methods of delivery. Ramsden (2003) strongly believes that the emphasis on academic development is reflective of “a government agenda of quality, value for money and enhanced participation” (p. 233). The growing importance of ensuring quality has led to increased academic development activity across universities due to an increasing “need to raise the profile of teaching in universities” as well as ensuring “students’ rising expectations as the fee-paying ‘consumers’ of higher education” can be met (Clark et al., 2002, p. 129).

Perceived importance of initial teacher development programs

Watters & Diezmann, (2005) contend that “if universities are to remain relevant in a knowledge society, they must not just be sites of knowledge production but also be effective knowledge disseminators through their service and teaching activities” (p.1). Teaching is complex in nature and with the changing demographics of university life various factors influence the need for programs focussing on teaching and learning. Increased student diversity and numbers combined with greater use of information technologies and a growing imperative to utilise Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs) for flexible delivery are often cited as reasons for ensuring academic staff are skilled in relation to these areas (Fraser, Dearn, & Ryan, 2003; McLoughlin & Samuels, 2002). Asmar (2002) further argues that the increased competition for both international students and high-achieving school leavers as well as the need to address attrition rates of commencing students have led the traditionally research-intensive universities to give greater consideration to teaching and learning.

Austin (2002) adds weight to the arguments listed and offers as a further influence the “retirement of significant numbers of senior faculty members occurring at a time when societal pressures of (sic) academic institutions is expanding” (p. 94). She also supports the argument that there is greater institutional accountability and increasing pressure on academic staff due to “tight financial constraints” (ibid). Likewise, Hardy and Smith (2006) suggest that the pressure “to generate revenue and contain costs, within an
increasingly competitive environment” has added to the complexity of the academic environment. They argue that “within this tighter fiscal environment, there has been a strong desire to monitor the performance of both personnel and practices” (p. 339).

Mirroring the diverse range of reasons for the importance of courses to support academic staff in their teaching are discussions about similar courses offered in Belgium (Stes, Clement, & Van Petegem, 2007), Sweden (Ahlberg, 2008), New Zealand (Tynan & Garbett, 2007) and Hong Kong (Ho, Watkins, & Kelly, 2001).

**Teaching professionalism and quality**

Although the literature review focuses on resources post 2000, Boyer was regarded as a prominent figure who informed debate and discussion around the importance of scholarly teaching. Ever since “there has been much international debate” (Healey, 2000) trying to understand and implement the idea of appropriate faculty scholarship so that the quality of teaching in higher education might be improved (Richlin, 2001; Watters & Diezmann, 2005). However, as Fleming, Shire, Jones, McNamee and Pill (2004) further observe it is not simply a matter of increasing the skills of academic staff but of encouraging university teachers to become professional by offering opportunities “to engage in critical reflexive pedagogy” and that this “is being widely acknowledged as an important element in [the] continuing professional development” (p. 165). Not a new idea, it gained momentum during the 1980s and 1990s as a result of the changing environment in higher education: moving from “academic autonomy to one of accountability to stakeholders” (ibid, p.166).

**Striving for quality: Learning, teaching and scholarship** a discussion paper arising from an Australian Government review into higher education in 2002 stated that teaching needed to be given much greater status in higher education as the teaching quality is central to learning. It argued that “a renewed focus on scholarship in teaching and a professionalisation of teaching practice” were required (DEST, 2002, p. x). It further suggested that formal preparation programs become mandatory; that a national accreditation process be established and that participation in these programs be linked to probation and promotion.
Accreditation

A range of reasons are attributed to the importance of developing accredited teaching courses and programs for new academics. According to Fraser et al. (2003) a need to develop a systematic approach which recognises standards of professional practice in relation to university teaching has gained widespread recognition “if only to provide a satisfactory form of quality assurance” (2003, p. 5).

Many countries do not have accredited teaching courses for academic staff. This may be because some academic staff dispute the value of both accreditation and teacher training. Their objections stem from a number of concerns including the approaches taken to address staff development needs. One major debate occurring in the late 1990s and early 2000 related to the accreditation of programs in the UK by the Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education (ILTHe) (Andresen, 2000; Jenkins, 1999; Rowland, Byron, Furedi, Padfield, & Smyth, 1998). This debate was concerned with the concept that generic programs could address disciplinary issues in how to teach in universities. It indicated concerns that academic autonomy may be threatened by these interventions.

Although accredited programs are becoming more widespread Fleming et al. (2004) indicate that the issue of accreditation is problematic because the programs often take a “broad, competence-based approach to professional development” (p. 166) or were perceived as ineffective because they were considered to be ‘one-size fits all’ approaches. Fleming et al. suggest that acceptance of development programs in teaching may depend on how academic staff perceive their own professional identities. This is also articulated by Andresen. Dearn et al. (2002) who report that “[w]hile all stakeholders supported the provision of CPE [Continuing Professional Education] for the teaching role, there was real ambivalence about accreditation to a profession of university teaching” (p. 54).

Different types of programs and courses

The PATHE website states that many higher education institutions provide structured programs (Staff Development and Training Unit Flinders University, 2003). Literature reveals that there is little consistency in the way that programs are offered, the skills and
experience acquired by participating staff differs from program to program and there is no uniformity in whether attendance is mandated. In the UK they are often compulsory for probationary purposes but this is less common in Australia (Clark et al., 2002).

Programs range from two or three day long seminars (Asmar, 2002; Breda, Clement, & Waeytens, 2003; Dearn et al., 2002; Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Stes et al., 2007), to courses that run for 13 weeks (Donnelly, 2006) or programs comprising one or two modules that require a year long commitment and whose participants achieve a university awarded postgraduate certificate (Mathias, 2005). Dearn et al. and Gibbs and Coffey (2000) also suggest that a disparity in approaches exists between the United States (US), where training focuses on teaching practices and the UK where reflective practice is emphasised. The various types of programs that are on offer include one day induction; skills based programs; mentoring programs; teaching assistant programs and post graduate certificates.

**Induction**

Staff induction is considered an important way of ensuring staff have an appreciation of their role and the organisation in which they are working (Barkhuizen, 2002; Dearn et al., 2002; Staniforth & Harland, 2006; Trowler & Knight, 2000). Induction programs are often seen as a way of socialising new staff into the workplace and according to Barlow and Antoniou (2007) they need to include important information about roles and should never be hurried or superficial. Staniforth and Harland discuss the role played by Heads of Departments in induction programs suggesting that “heads should systematically monitor the quality and effectiveness of induction processes and outcomes” (p. 194).

**Mentoring programs**

One UK based program featured mentors as an integral part. Mathias (2005) indicated that the aim of using mentors was to establish “a genuine collegial partnership between participants’ departments and the programme providers” (p. 97). It was determined that mentors would support “the development of participants’ teaching roles, both generically and within the context of the subject-discipline” (p. 98). Clark et al. (2002) also suggested that the use of mentors could provide discipline based support to program participants in an effort to encourage new staff to discuss teaching with colleagues and
address issues related to translating the generic learning acquired on programs into specific disciplinary contexts.

**Teaching assistant programs**

According to Austin (2002) the Teaching Assistant (TA) programs in the US are usually designed to provide support for professors in universities by doctoral students who act as tutors, markers, lecturers on undergraduate programs and as research assistants. Austin argues that while it may appear that the role of a teaching assistant may provide a valuable training opportunity for the doctoral student who intends to become an academic this is not always the case. She states that the “use of TAs usually responds to departmental needs to cover courses or sections, not to the development of future professors” (p. 105). Austin indicated that TAs were given little opportunity to reflect on their experiences or to discuss how they felt about their careers or their teaching experiences, suggesting that they have few opportunities to reflect on practice.

**Short courses and postgraduate certificates**

Many resources discuss specific programs and how they prepare new university staff as teachers. Dearn et al. (2002) argue that in Australia despite an appreciation of the importance of the teaching role and an increased understanding of how best to support “the academic development of teaching expertise” the provision of programs “remains largely unsystematic and *ad hoc*” (p. 1). Their report stated that “almost one quarter of universities do not conduct any initial teaching preparation programs for their staff” (ibid p. iv). Goody’s (2007) recent review confirms that this information is still correct. It found that nearly seventy five per cent of Australian universities now offer teaching preparation activities which ‘require’ staff to participate in them.

Goody (2007) provides an overview of twenty five of the Foundations programs that are offered across Australia. He identifies Foundations programs as “formal programs that induct and develop university teachers with the aim of fostering and supporting the quality of teaching and learning in the university” (p. 1). They are usually completed within the first three years of employment and offer more than induction. Most of the Australian courses were mandatory, non-award programs that did not include formal assessment but did require that participants engage in specific activities (such as the
presentation of a teaching portfolio, engagement in an online discussion or peer observations of teaching) to satisfactorily complete the course. Many of the Australian courses comprised the first unit of a graduate certificate.

Gibbs and Coffey (2004) conducted a review of programs offered in twenty universities across eight countries. They found that the programmes which lasted between sixty and three hundred hours in length included a series of meetings and learning activities that spread over a four to eighteen month time frame and many included a formal assessment. The courses assessed by Gibbs and Coffey were also components of a graduate certificate.

In the US the Mathematical Association of America had developed a program called Project NExT which provided opportunities for new or recent PhD students to “learn how to enhance their teaching and launch their mathematical careers” (Gallian et al., 2000, p. 217). The national program allows students to participate in meetings, short courses and workshops which focus on teaching in undergraduate programs. A similar program was developed by the National Science Foundation (NSF) (also in the US).

In the NSF case graduate teaching fellowships are provided to support “colleges and universities in integrating K-12 teaching experiences into the education of graduate students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics” (Trautmann, 2008, p. 41). It is acknowledged that scepticism exists among “some members of the science education community” but their concerns are usually addressed once these sceptics have seen the program in action (p. 42). This allows participants to gain experience in writing teaching philosophy statements and to “enhance their teaching skills through progressive responsibilities undertaken under faculty guidance, and assemble a portfolio demonstrating and reflecting on these teaching experiences” (p. 44).

It is clear from this brief description of what is offered that Gibbs and Coffey’s (2000) discussion about the vast differences between programs is accurate. They indicate that in some cases the goals and priorities of some programs are “diametrically opposed to the priorities of others, particularly with regard to the emphasis given to the acquisition of basic teaching competence or skill” (p. 42). While this may not in itself be problematic it does raise concerns regarding accreditation and professionalisation of university teachers.
Teaching models and methods

According to Dearn et al. (2002), formal award sessions are important since they move beyond teaching staff skills and concentrate on dealing with pedagogy and contextual issues about teaching and learning. Rust (2000) concurs suggesting that courses and programs need to go beyond providing hints and tips to ensure that they effect behavioural change. He also contends that behaviour changes can be achieved by including elements of reflective practice in programs and recommends that participants develop teaching portfolios as a way of reflecting on their practice.

Reflective practice attributed to Schon is considered an important component of many UK and Australian approaches to teacher education since it emphasises the importance of critical reflection, review and development (Clark et al., 2002; D'Andrea & Gosling, 2001; Dearn et al., 2002; Mathias, 2005; McLean & Bullard, 2000; McLoughlin & Samuels, 2002; Pill, 2005; Rust, 2000). Likewise programs in both Finland (Postareff, Lindblom-Ylänne, & Nevgi, 2007) and Belgium (Breda et al., 2003; Stes et al., 2007) also include reflective practice however its use is not limited to just these countries.

Gibbs and Coffey (2000) suggest that it is important to ensure that the focus of the learning experience is on the student rather than on the teacher. They suggest that there needs to be a “shift from a focus on the content, to a focus on the process in terms of teacher behaviour, and finally to a focus on learning outcomes”. Many others agree with Gibbs and Coffey (McLean & Bullard, 2000; Postareff et al., 2007; Stes et al., 2007). McLoughlin and Samuels (2002) describe one way that this may be acquired. They suggest,

A program that serves to foster the scholarship of teaching while at the same time providing academics the scope and time to develop professional interests and a portfolio, critical reflection on curriculum design, assessment approaches, and evaluation aspects of higher education seems to be a useful type of intervention to foster better university teaching/learning (p. 455).
Certificated workshops and programs are often made up of a range of other components. These include:

- opportunities to learn by doing (Clark et al., 2002) also known as experiential learning (Pill, 2005);

- action research (Ho et al., 2001; McLoughlin & Samuels, 2002; Postareff et al., 2007);

- the development of student or learner centred approaches (Asmar, 2002; Donnelly, 2006; Gibbs & Coffey, 2000; Ho et al.; Postareff et al.; Stes et al., 2007; Trowler & Cooper, 2002);

- development of communities of practice (Pickering, 2006; Viskovic, 2006); and

- a specific emphasis on the scholarship of teaching (Asmar; Fraser et al., 2003; McLoughlin & Samuels).

In addition to the various components that make up workshops and programs Rust (2000) refers to the six models which are based on different theoretical frameworks originally discussed by Gilbert and Gibbs. They are behavioural change models; developmental models, conceptual change models, reflective practise models, student learning models and hybrids. Regardless of the method of teaching or model used it is essential that programs are evaluated to determine their effectiveness.

**Courses and program evaluation**

Despite the importance of evaluating the impact of programs which prepare academic staff as they commence teaching practice Coffey and Gibbs (2000a) argue that there is little evidence to support the notion that teacher training has an impact on university teaching. They claim that empirical evidence is limited and that where it does exist it has “weak conceptual underpinnings” (p. 32). McLean and Bullard (2000) agree suggesting that there is “little evidence about the effectiveness of different programmes and courses beyond participant satisfaction” (p. 80).
Rust (2000) in supporting these claims indicates that a great deal of the research has focused on particular development activities rather than looking at the overall impact of the courses or programmes. However, he also pointed out that an Australian study carried out by Nasr in 1996 revealed that university teachers with a post graduate teaching qualification were more likely to receive more positive feedback from students than those who did not have a qualification.

A more recent study by Gibbs and Coffey (2004) focussed on determining three different aspects of the impact of courses and programs namely how student learning outcomes were achieved; whether changes in teachers’ conceptions about teaching had occurred and if there was an improvement in teachers’ skills. Their study examined these outcomes across twenty universities in eight countries, using three methods of evaluation. They used three different questionnaires (Student Evaluation of Educational Quality (SEEQ), a Module Experience Questionnaire (MEQ) which was adapted from the Course Experience Questionnaire (CEQ) and an ‘Approaches to Teaching Inventory’ (ATI)) which were administered to participating staff and students twice, over a twelve month period. While this was a complex methodology it appears that this degree of effort may be required to ensure programs are comprehensively and effectively evaluated. Using this framework to analyse training programs Gibbs and Coffey (2004) were able to assert that “those institutions that had training also had teachers who improved” (p. 99).

Ho et al. (2001) conducted a similarly complex study at the Hong Kong Polytechnic University. They used participant interviews, CEQs and Approaches to Studying Inventory (ASI) to evaluate “the effect on conceptions of teaching of the participants; the effect on their teaching practices and the effect on the approaches to studying of their students” (p. 147). Their study found that there is evidence to support “that a development in teaching conceptions can lead to improvements in teaching practices and in student learning, and that this can happen within a short period of time” (ibid p. 165). Rather than attempting to evaluate all three aspects examined by Coffey and Gibbs (2000b) and Ho et al. in the same study other evaluation studies have focussed on assessing one or two aspects of the impact of courses or programs.

Using observations of teaching, semi-structured interviews and reflective commentaries written by participants Pickering (2006) examined how and what lecturers learned about
teaching and how changes were and were not implemented following participation in programs. Stes et al. (2007) not only explored the impact of course involvement on individual teachers but also considered the outcomes of such participation for the organisation. A number of studies explored the impact that partaking in a course had on teaching practice (Donnelly, 2006; Postareff et al., 2007; Rust, 2000; Stes et al.). Each of these studies used different methods including surveys, focus group studies and interviews.

Different evaluation methods are required to examine different aspects of program outcomes. These studies indicate that longitudinal studies (taking place over at least one year) that either examine specific changes in all of the following: student learning outcomes, changes in teachers conceptions about teaching and improvement in teachers’ skills or in one or two of these aspects provide the best indication of how courses and programs impact on teaching and learning outcomes. These studies indicate that evaluation needs to be sufficiently complex to meaningfully reflect whether the programs’ desired outcomes are effectively met.

### Potential problems

**Competition between teaching and research**

According to the literature the issue of ensuring courses and programs positively affect teaching and learning outcomes is only one potential issue that requires addressing. Hardy and Smith (2006) raised criticisms about increasing the importance of teaching based on the value traditionally given to research. They argued that as research is often a criterion for promotion it is privileged over teaching. This criticism is further supported by Donnelly (2006) and Tynan and Garbett (2007). Donnelly suggests that the status of teaching in higher education has been lowered as research has become exalted. Both Tynan and Garbett and Hardy and Smith argue that research is perceived to be more important because it is related to promotion. These arguments are supported by comments from Hunt (2007) who advocates that training courses in how to teach are problematic in institutions where teaching has a lower status than research. She indicates
that “even in universities that claim to give greater recognition to teaching, lecturers
dee m it a career hazard not to prioritise research” (author’s emphasis) (p. 773). Clark et
al. (2002) suggests that “learning how to teach in higher education creates a tension in
new lecturers between their research expertise, confirmed by their recent appointment,
and their inexperience in teaching” (p. 133).

Dearn et al. (2002) recommend that teaching and research need to be meshed proposing
that the discussion about teaching needs to be informed by research. They also advise that
teaching needs to be given greater priority and those institutional structures that are
related to reward and recognition need to be changed so that teaching and research may
be equally valued (Andresen, 2000; Fraser, 2005; Gibbs & Coffey, 2000). Addressing
these conditions may also help combat the stress experienced by many new academic
staff as they attempt to determine how to prioritise their research and teaching
commitments while learning how to teach (Barbour et al., 2000; Pickering, 2006).

**Willingness to participate in programs**

The notion of competing workloads and commitment to a Graduate Certificate program
was also discussed by Dearn et al. (2002) who extend the argument to all professional
development related to teaching. They suggest that “heavy workloads and a lack of
resources [are] precluding staff from taking and being offered teaching education
opportunities” (p. 51).

Hardy and Smith (2006) suggest that localised factors such as a participant’s willingness
to be a novice, their discipline background and their experience may impact on their
successful participation in the Graduate Certificate in University Teaching and Learning.
They also indicate that providing participants with time release from their usual work
activities while they participated in the program would allow courses to be completed
more quickly. Fleming et al. (2004) also highlights the fact that formal allocation of time
to participate in professional development activities was an important issue. Once staff
are available to participate it is essential to ensure that all aspects of the program relate to
the participants’ work (Hardy & Smith).
Departmental cultures

The literature reveals that even where time is allocated to allow staff to attend programs there is a need to identify ways of addressing departmental cultures. It is imperative that once new academic staff have participated in a program and attempt to utilise what they have learned within the departmental settings that their teaching and ideas are supported (Donnelly, 2006; Gibbs & Coffey, 2000, 2004; Mathias, 2005). Staniforth and Harland (2006) and Knight and Trowler (2000) suggest that academic leadership impacts on departmental cultures and that the leaders in departments may impact on how teaching is viewed and supported. Allowing staff who have participated on courses to be assigned a departmental mentor is one suggested way of providing this support (Clark et al., 2002; D'Andrea & Gosling, 2001; Mathias, 2005).

Another recommended method for ensuring new staff are able to adapt their training to the departmental culture is the establishment of communities of practice so that staff are not isolated when they return to their department (Mathias, 2005; Trowler & Knight, 2000; Viskovic, 2006). Bringing people from different disciplines together so that staff may realise what they have in common with others across the university (Barlow & Antoniou, 2007; Clark et al., 2002; Postareff et al., 2007) was seen as a way of breaking down departmental cultures. It was also suggested as a way of helping staff realise that the teaching methods they were learning could be applied across disciplines.

Conclusion

It is clear from the literature examined for this review that the notion that improvement in the preparation of university teachers is considered an important issue in many universities across a number of countries. However, it remains unclear whether the student learning experience is improved as a result of an improvement in the preparation of university teachers.

The literature indicates that initial teacher training programs are important for a variety of reasons. These include the changes that are occurring in higher education as a result of technological advances, increasing student attendance at universities, an aging lecturer population and an expectation that universities should be more accountable to funding...
bodies and other stakeholders (students, parents, employers etc). This accountability encompasses a quality agenda which encourages the ‘professionalisation’ of university teaching staff through participation in accredited courses and programs. While the need for professionalisation remains contested courses and programs continue to be developed.

The variety of courses and programs embrace numerous theoretical frameworks and pedagogical practices. The differences between them include a range of sometimes contradictory or conflicting outcomes which make it difficult to compare programs and determine their effectiveness. Evaluation of programs to determine whether the student learning experience is improved as a result of staff participating in them is therefore complex.

A range of other issues impact on participation in courses and programs designed to support academic staff new to teaching. One of these issues is the value placed on teaching. Where teaching is considered less important than research, participation in programs will not necessarily engender change in attitudes or practice. If practice is not changed then participation in courses is less effective. This has an impact on workload and raises concerns regarding the support given to staff for their attendance. It is also important to ensure that on returning to their academic departments the culture within the department is set up to support the learning that has occurred on the program and provide opportunities for participants to discuss what they have learned with other staff in the department. If issues such as valuing teaching and identifying ways of supporting staff who attend courses are not addressed their value will continue to be contested.

This brief summary of the literature review indicates that the research questions identified in the Project proposal are relevant and important. The questions identified in the Project proposal were:

1. What are the different approaches to the preparation of academics as they commence their teaching practice in Australian and international higher education?

2. How can the impact of these programs be evaluated?
3. What are the conditions and models that best produce the desired impacts on student learning, teaching-learning scholarship, teaching as leadership and institutional practice?

4. What are the best processes to support the dissemination of materials and practices across the sector and ensure the uptake and embedding of effective practice?

5. What are the resources and ongoing professional development requirements of those who teach in these programs?

6. What induction processes best meet the teaching needs of academics at the time of appointment?

7. What should be included in national benchmarks for quality induction of academics to teaching and learning in Australian higher education? (Gannaway et al., 2007, p. 4)

All of these questions require further exploration. This literature review has highlighted some issues that address the first two and the sixth of the questions. Identifying conditions and models that best produce desired impacts, the ongoing professional development requirements of those who teach on these programs and issues regarding national benchmarks are not addressed in any substantial way.

Asmar (2002) and Brew (2003) maintain that rather than considering the privilege given to research as a barrier to promoting the importance of teaching it should be utilised as a way to improve academic development. While McLoughlin and Samuels (2002) do not discuss whether research is favoured over teaching they do suggest that it must inform the way that academic development occurs. It is recommended that further research is conducted in relation to all of the research questions raised for this project so that the project’s aim to “improve the student learning experience through improvement in the preparation of university teachers” may be achieved.
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