24. In the light of the 1975 budgetary situation, the Government set aside the reports of the Universities Commission, the Commission on Advanced Education, and the Australian Committee on Technical and Further Education which recommended financial assistance for their respective sectors for what was to have been the 1976-78 triennium. Instead, the Government decided that, for funding purposes, 1976 would be treated as a year outside the triennial progression.

25. The origins of academic staff training in the United Kingdom

Universities have for centuries rejected the idea that academic staff require any formal training for their jobs other than that which is subject-matter based, and it has long been the tradition that staff need receive no formal training whatsoever in teaching administration or indeed in research.

Only in the last forty years has this tradition been openly challenged in any real measure. Trusco., for example, argued that the “only effective remedy for [appalling] teaching is for lectures to be made better by ‘subjecting all would-be university lecturers to a specific course of training’,” and this theme was pursued by a growing number of individuals over the next decade. Despite such concern however, the ranks of academe remained largely unmoved. Radcliffe noted that the idea of training new recruits to university teaching was largely “shrugged off with a quantity of humorous or supercilious comment.” Nevertheless, this period marked the beginnings of a recognition in the United Kingdom of the need for professional training of university teachers and a growing questioning of the tenability of the traditional view of university teaching as either a self-taught art or a craft passed on informally from master to apprentice.

This post-war period also marked a beginning interest by the AUT (The Association of University Teachers) in the improvement of university teaching, and twice during this time (in 1945 and 1954) the union approached the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP) on the question of training for academic staff.

National initiatives

The period from 1961-1974 (when the Agreement on Probationary Procedures and Criteria came into being) was remarkable for a number of national initiatives in the university sector which were subsequently to colour the whole area of academic staff training in the UK. Of all these initiatives perhaps that which had the most far-reaching consequences for the UK university system was the Report of the Robbins Committee on Higher Education in 1963.

The Committee on Higher Education, under the Chairmanship of Lord Robbins, was appointed in February 1961 by the Prime Minister
NUS initiatives

In a memorandum to the Halse Committee on University Teaching Methods published in June 1961, the National Union of Students (NUS) referred to the necessity of ensuring that the university teacher is suitably qualified to lecture and to supervise tutorial work.

Reporting in April 1968 the Commission recommended that all lecturers should be trained either before taking up their posts or, where that was not possible, during the first three years of their appointments.

In addition, the number and range of short training courses for lecturers already in service should be expanded and lecturers should be more actively encouraged by their institutions to make use of these courses.

A Groundswell of Opinion

In short, the movement for an improvement in the standards of university teaching gathered momentum over the thirty years prior to 1940-1970. Such that the traditional view outlined in the opening paragraphs of this paper — namely that university teachers required no training outside their subject matter — came under increasing attack from a widening variety of sources. The few individuals who in the 1940s (and previously) had pleaded for training were now joined by a growing awareness among the students, the academic, and the public that university teaching was not what it was sometimes taken to be — a task of imparting knowledge blindly and mechanically. As the concept of higher education was expanded and enfranchised as a national responsibility, it seemed at the time (in what might loosely be described as a "pay and productivity" agreement) between the employers and the union and government.

The 1974 Agreement on Probation

Following yet another approach early in 1961 to CVCP about academic staff training and the need to examine teaching methods, the AUT established a working group on Teaching Techniques in January 1963. This panel, in an interim report, made a number of suggestions for improving university teaching. These included a strong recommendation for the establishment of an "establishment of inservice training courses for both new and experienced staff."

In March 1966, in its quinquennial submission to the UGC, the AUT proposed the establishment of a national staff college to act as a focus for future training. The Board had seen a need for passage beyond the method of implementation of the Board's recommendations should be left to each institution, though the Board had referred to the possibility of establishing what came to be known as the Education Development Centre (EDC).

It was clear that something had to be done — but what? The need for training had been clearly established and the will for it has been demonstrated by the relevant national bodies, but would the individual university institutions accept the need and implement actions? A solution was found (or so it seemed at the time) in what might loosely be described as a "pay and productivity" agreement between the employers and the union and government.

The UGC wrote:

"The working party is of the opinion that Universities must maintain high standards of selection procedures when they are considering making appointments to their academic staff. Where appointments have a probationary period it is incumbent on universities to provide training for the appointees.

Training procedures to be improved with the following. Areas: the nature of the probationary period, selection, training and development, for confirmation, and review procedure. The sections of the agreement which dealt specifically with training for probationary lecturers were as follows:

Selection, Training and Development

4. The Working Party is of the opinion that Universities must maintain high standards of selection procedures when they are considering making appointments to their academic staff. Where appointments have a probationary period it is incumbent on universities to provide training for the appointees.

5. The primary consideration for the employing university in deciding whether or not to retain a person at the conclusion of their probation must be the long-term needs of the university itself, of the other members of its staff, and of its students. In so far as it is apparent that a university has a responsibility to assist the development of a probationer whom it does not wish to retain.

6. An employing university which declines to retain a probationer on account of its long-term prospects should provide, if at all possible, a clear statement of its reasons for refusal. The probationer should, if at all possible, be given an opportunity to appeal against the decision of the university in connection with the probationary period, and also some concern for the future of a probationer whom it does not wish to retain.

7. As Matheson notes, it was to take a further three years before detailed agreement was reached by a Working Party of Committee A on the procedures and criteria to be used in conjunction with the probationary period, and a formal UAP/UAT "Agreement on Probation" was not circulated to universities until October 1974.

The agreement, formally known as the Agreement concerning the procedure and criteria to be used in connection with the Probationary Period, "covered the following points:

(i) advice and guidance by a senior colleague nominated for this task.

(ii) encouragement to attend formal courses of instruction at both local and national levels.
• Duties and Workload
The allocation of day-to-day duties and workload approaches average, in the opinion of the probationer's age, standing and experience.

Under the terms of the agreement, an employing university when to retain a person should be able to show that these requirements have been met. How individual institutions were to meet these requirements for a person to retain the position, the document led the Co-ordinating Committee to abandon its plans for publication and the document.

The document led the Co-ordinating Committee to abandon its plans for publication and the document led the Co-ordinating Committee to produce in the form of a preliminary draft document for implementation of the Agreement and that many recommendations were not spelt out in the Agreement.

However, the experience of the Co-ordinating Officer was that there was considerable confusion standing and experience. The Co-ordinating Committee (CCTUT), established by CVCP in February 1972, appointed a Co-ordinating Committee in September 1973 and in June 1974 convened its first national conference on academic standards.
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The Co-ordinating Committee (CCTUT) established by CVCP in February 1972 appointed a Co-ordinating Committee in September 1973 and in June 1974 convened its first national conference on academic standards.

Any picture so derived will be incomplete. Nor should staff at one institution have greater opportunities than staff at another institution.

The low level of funding reported in 1974-75 was still very much in evidence in 1976-77 and the position had not changed radically by 1979-80. CCTUT's final report, published in 1980, was the most vocal of the three reports in its recommendation that the low level of funding must be interpreted as indicative of limited progress.
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In summary, the current situation looks bleak indeed. There is now little opportunity for national co-ordination. It is the dominating authority and signs of a decreasing commitment at local level. On this positive side, interest in academic staff development has quickened over the past two decades. The provision made by UK universities for staff training and development has burgeoned. An increasing number of academic staff are devoting themselves, on a full-time, part-time or spare-time basis, to providing formal staff development programmes and informal help, guidance and consultancy for their colleagues. Opportunities abound in many institutions for academic staff to be induced into their institutions, to improve their lecturing, to learn about groups, to examine appraisal procedures and so on. More is written about staff training and development than ever before.

Despite all this, as Matheson observes, staff development is at risk. It would take very little by the way of political or financial pressure to destroy existing formal provisions for staff development from the higher education scene. The likelihood of such pressure being applied increases at times of budgetary stringency. As universities themselves factor on the book of a new era characterized by unforced reinvention, it is inevitable that the accomplishments of staff development are coming under scrutiny. The longer staff development, if undertook, are bleak.

Effects of the Agreement on Individual Members of Staff

The agreement which prompted such apparent activity at both national and local levels might be expected to also have a significant effect on individual members of staff. It is therefore a matter of considerable regret that any effect of the UAP/AUT Agreement on individual lecturers (beyond those actively engaged in the provision of training and development activities) is difficult to discern in our UK universities. It is possible that a casual survey of academic quickly confirms that a majority are not even aware of the Agreement's existence. Those who are aware generally know the content - or intent - and the mainstream of British Academic remains uninformed; indeed, unheard of, by its advent.

One might expect the Agreement, in implementation, would carry with it consequences for the individual lecturer — for instance in his or her working relationships with colleagues, head of department and with students in the provision of training and development activities.
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20. Liberal Senator and Chairman of the Government Members' Committee on Education, Science and the Environment, in the April 1982 edition of Vesates. Mr. Puplick said of universities: 'In seeking to set themselves apart, or perhaps it would be more accurate to say, in allowing themselves to remain apart, the universities have found that they have been threatened by the cutting edge of governments, they have virtually no protection and their cries for mercy have struck few responsive chords in the wider community.'

Professor Caro remarked: 'I have little doubt he is right. What should we be doing about it? The image of universities in the public is vital. As both Professor Karl and Professor Caro have observed, a pre-requisite for the universities' self-promotion is the certainty that their own houses are in order.' Justified complaints by the community of inadequacies in management, staff performance and academic standards, must be faced and rectified. The universities must then go on to correct a situation that can be simply illustrated by two parallel lines. On the top line are people involved in tertiary education, convinced of its importance, of the need to maintain the system in a healthy state and carrying those on the bottom line, the politicians, businessmen, journalists and members of the public who allegedly make misguided criticisms based on ignorance. The lines are parallel, they do not intersect, there are few cross lines of communication, so the alleged falsehoods remain uncorrected to the continuing detriment of the system.

The proper relationship should be circuitous. The universities should promote a strong image in the public mind, backed by substance, that their work is vital to the well-being of society and is worth defending when its integrity is threatened. If the image cannot easily be impressed on the minds of the majority, then at least it must be first impressed on the minds of the influential. Universities will find only a tenuous basis for survival if they fail to fulfill their traditional and developing roles, unless they make the effort to explain themselves to the public. The pursuit of excellence must be explained if it is to be maintained.

THE NEED FOR UNIVERSITY PUBLIC RELATIONS

Amid the flood of conflicting opinions about what has happened to tertiary education over the past eighteen months", only the most limited consensus has emerged. The basic line was probably drawn by the Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University and former Chairman of the Commonwealth Tertiary Education Commission, Professor Peter Karl, at the July 1982 conference of tertiary education administrators and academics at the Darling Downs Institute of Advanced Education. Disagreeing with the conference title, 'The Reorganisation of Tertiary Education in Australia', Professor Karl suggested that instead we had witnessed a major reallocation of the resources in higher education devoted to teacher education to meet the changed circumstances of the 1980s.

Few would argue with that statement, but opinions as to why the reallocation happened and whether it should have happened, are likely to diverge considerably.

There is one point on which, it appears to be total consensus: that the public by and large are at best indifferent and at worst apathetic to the needs and purposes of tertiary education in Australia. At the 1982 Conference of University Governing Bodies sponsored by the Australian Vice-Chancellors' Committee, the Director of the British Technical Change Centre and former Vice-Chancellor of the University of Sydney, Professor Sir Bruce Williams, listed inable opinions concerning the universities as his first concern about Australian tertiary education. Professor Karl told the conference delegates that universities were seen as comprising:

- a very high proportion of layabout bludgers, who don't work very hard and when they do work don't do it very well. Unoubtedly there are a large number of such people around universities, there are in every walk of life. The only reason they are picked out in universities is because there is a general hostility and anti-intellectual climate towards higher education.

In a paper delivered the previous day, the AVCC Chairman and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, Professor David Caro, noted a statement by Mr. Christopher Puplick, a former NSW Minister for Public Libraries.

"Article submitted in September 1982."