

TERTIARY DIDACTICS*

W. J. Louw

As one leaves through the University Yearbooks and studies them from a historical overview, it is conspicuous that the enrollment during the past 50 years increased from 1,074 students in 1930 to more than 17,000 in 1980.

In 1930, the 1,074 students are enrolled in six faculties, u.e., Letters and Sciences, Law, Mathematics and Natural Science, Agricultural Sciences, Business, and Public Administration (which later becomes the Faculty of Economics and Political Science), and Veterinary Science. In 1929, the establishment of courses in Architecture are begun (1).

The general nature of teaching in the 1930's is more evenly spread between general forming and vocationally directed training than is the case today. Today, the approximately 18,000 students are enrolled in 12 faculties, of which Law, Education, Theology (A and B), Veterinary Science, Medicine, Dentistry, and Engineering are mainly attuned to vocational preparation and training. Statistics emphasize this tendency: in 1972, of all newly enrolled first-year students, 77% are enrolled in one or another form of vocational training (2).

Irrespective of all other related factors, the significant increase in the number of students, and their focus on vocational preparation and training, certainly is of greatest importance in the context of the University's teaching task. On the one hand, the large number of students necessarily compels the instructors to effectively exercise their teaching activities with more circumspection and greater insight and, on the other hand, the University must cautiously use its relationship with the organized professions, and especially their

* *Pedagogiekjoernaal* (1980), Vol. 1, No. 2, 199-214. EDITED March 2024.

desires in teaching (regarding both content and form). These matters remain problematic and have implications for the students and their achievements ⁽³⁾.

However, the University aims at more than merely vocational training. It also wants to form a student, in the didactic sense of the word. The University identifies the following ways of attaining this latter aim: orienting a student regarding the nature and methods of the science he/she studies; orienting a student regarding areas of knowledge peripheral to his/her science, to achieve an integration; orienting a student regarding the relationship between particular scientific knowledge and his/her future professional activities, and unifying scientific and professional study in forming a student.

The University is entirely cognizant of the problems of teaching resulting from the above-mentioned related factors. From time to time, the Senate has appointed ad hoc committees to give an account of specific problems. For example, in 1950, there is the ad hoc Senate committee, under the chairmanship of Prof. G. Cronje, and later Prof. B. F. Nel, which addresses particular problems ⁽⁴⁾. In 1950, there are eight faculties (Education is established in 1937, and Medicine in 1943) with a total student enrollment of 3,611. This is also the period of the rise of all kinds of teaching aids of greater or lesser technological and electronic sophistication, and the Senate committee is charged with expressing itself regarding the instructional possibilities of such aids. Thus, for example, Prof. P. J. J. du Plessis, of the Faculty of Education, and Mr. F. W. Meerkotter, Technical Advisor of the University, are delegated to attend the "First National Conference on Teaching Machines and Programmed Instruction" in Johannesburg. Based on the Du Plessis and Meerkotter report, the committee does not recommend the largescale purchase of teaching and learning machines. The decision is to first determine what the didactic possibilities are of such machines. With this, the Nel Committee also takes a general focus on defining instructional "hardware," which later is inherited by the Van der Stoep Committee, i.e., as far as instructional innovations are concerned, it is prudent to thoroughly determine what their actual positive teaching possibilities are before expenditure, and internal reorganization are begun and undertaken.

In 1967, at its usual meeting on 5 April, the Senate decides to establish a standing Senate Committee to go into appropriate matters regarding university teaching, and to report back to the Senate. The Committee becomes known as the "Senate Committee of Academic Teaching Methods and Aids" with the charge: "as quickly as possible, to issue an ad hoc report, and after that, to issue an annual report to the Senate" (5). The first Committee consists of Professors F. van der Stoep (chair), P. de V. Pienaar, L. A. Prinsloo, J. C. Bonsma, T. R. Barrowman, Drs. S. Strydom, J. R. Pauw, L. van Biljon, and Mr. D. J. Hattingh. The Committee has the right to attain cooperation from and give members of the Senate the opportunity, from time to time, to submit to the Committee additional aspects of teaching for study.

At the request of the Senate, the Van der Stoep Committee convenes a conference for the 15th and 16th of February 1968 to consider first year attrition. In its report, the Committee refers to two matters addressed at the conference, and which have important consequences for the University: first, penetrating scientific research must be done into the origins of first year attrition and, second, the establishment of a Department of University Didactics is strongly recommended (6). These findings later form the foundation for establishing the Division of Planning University Teaching, of the Student Services Bureau, and for establishing the Tertiary Teaching Diploma in the Faculty of Education.

The Committee is also active in 1968, and on 16, 17 and 18 October, it arranges a demonstration of teaching aids on Campus, and gives the Senate a report on various aspects of university teaching. In 1969, on order from the Senate, the Committee pilots a study of the proper use of Closed-Circuit Television (C.C.T.V.) in teaching (7). In April 1969, the Committee also receives a request from the Senate to design research on the purposeful use of core notes (8). Prof. van der Stoep's report on this matter, "Core notes: their didactic possibilities and limits", later forms the basis for the University's policy regarding the dictation method, which, for the most part, has been abolished, and of providing core notes to students. The

duplication division must be expanded in accordance with this policy, and today the University has sophisticated apparatuses to effectively carry out this task.

As far as research on the use of C.C.T.V. is concerned, on recommendation of the Van der Stoep Committee, the University assigns Prof. L. van Biljon to do a report on this matter. After visiting the U.S.A. and Europe, Prof. Van Biljon presents his report on 9 December 1969. Over and above recommendations of a technical nature, Prof. Van Biljon finds it didactically desirable to establish C.C.T.V. His recommendations are accepted, in principle, and today the University possesses not only the necessary installations for C.C.T.V. in its new buildings, but also a large, professional T.V. studio. Today, it is especially in vocational training that C.C.T.V. has been introduced and successfully used.

From its inception in 1967, the Van der Stoep Committee experiences problems in implementing its recommendations regarding university teaching. On 3 October 1969, the committee chairman, and other department chairmen, have penetrating discussions with the (Academic) Registrar (Prof. E. M. Hamman, at the time) about establishing a bureau/department/division for higher (university) teaching, with the possibility that such a bureau be attached to the Student Counseling Division ⁽⁹⁾. The idea is that such a firmly founded and mandated bureau could carry out the continuous research necessary on university teaching and, thus, would be able to make certain recommendations with more authority. The (Academic) Registrar is strongly in favor of establishing such a bureau under the direct administration of his office. This would provide the University with the necessary organization to carry through on the bureau's findings to improve teaching. In this regard, both this conference and the recommendations of the Van der Stoep Committee in its 1968 annual report, later forms the foundation for the organization and continuation of the University's teaching policy.

At this time, the University of Pretoria does not stand alone with respect to the teaching problems of instructors, and the learning problems of students. On 17 October 1969, the Committee of

University Heads (CUH) convenes a meeting of an ad hoc committee concerning Research on University Problems. Prof. van der Stoep is delegated to represent the University of Pretoria ⁽¹⁰⁾. During this meeting, the ad hoc committee proposes that the CUH appoint a standing committee for coordinating and improving research on problems of university teaching. Such a committee is established, and exists today under the chairmanship of Prof. E. Marais, Rector, University of Port Elizabeth. In 1978, this committee holds a national symposium on problems of university teaching, where the problems of the passage from school to university are thoroughly discussed. After the symposium ended, the CUH requests that universities give an account of the matters discussed, and the ways in which each university is making provisions for dealing with them. In this way, the University of Pretoria is more widely connected with reflections on problems of university teaching, and on this level, it also has made valuable contributions.

In 1970, the Van der Stoep Committee continues its good work, and organizes another teaching aids demonstration for 1971, but this time, it is limited to closed-circuit television ⁽¹¹⁾. In 1970, a conference for instructors is also held on bottlenecks in university teaching, and an extensive report is presented where the most important problems are focused on, and certain recommendations are made.

Clearly, it is from the formal agendas of the Van der Stoep Committee that the committee gradually realizes its recommendations on matters concerning general university teaching are not being considered further in favorable ways or implemented ⁽¹²⁾. Particularly, the committee identifies four important problems, i.e., the scope of the committee's work; the lack of reactions to the committee's recommendations; the handicaps the University of Pretoria has with respect to modern teaching aids, and the need for a department/bureau/etc. to undertake systematic research. These matters are discussed thoroughly with the (Academic) Registrar, and the committee is assured that the authorities are fully informed of the need for comprehensive research. The registrar also indicates that the prevailing shortage of money would delay or make it impossible to implement certain

recommendations. What is especially important here is that the (Academic) Registrar has informed the committee that the University, in the light of its recommendations, is considering establishing a Bureau to take over the research and other obligations of the committee. Then, the task of such a Bureau is to make available systematic scientific particulars of matters relating to university teaching, the structure and organization of which are to be determined later. At the same time, permission is given for installing small television sets, where funds are available.

In 1971, it also is recommended that the committee's name be changed to the "Committee for University Teaching" so that its activities would be reflected in its name ⁽¹³⁾. This recommendation is never accepted, and the committee keeps its name until its dissolution. During this period, the committee becomes the center to which all problems regarding university teaching, and related matters, are channeled. In the same year, the Senate, for the first time, proposes that a sub-committee of the Van der Stoep Committee, in cooperation with the Faculty of Education, regulate a course for instructors in 1972 ⁽¹⁴⁾. During the following meeting, the committee decides that a course of a largely practical nature be instituted which would last for at least one semester; that it be offered after-hours, once a week by the Faculty of Education and, as far as possible, provide an overview of all the practical aspects of university teaching within which methodology, chalkboard work, aids, etc. are discussed. It is further decided that new instructors, who do not possess a teaching qualification, be required to attend the course. This decision is made known to the authorities, and they enthusiastically awaited its implementation. Because the establishment of the Student Services Bureau (SSB) is still pending, and the idea is proposed that the SSB also be responsible for regulating and offering courses in university didactics for instructors, the recommendation of the Senate is temporarily set aside. This recommendation by the Senate is later implemented, and sees its fruits in the establishment of a Tertiary Teaching Diploma in the Faculty of Education. This diploma is discussed below.

During its meeting of 16 March 1972, however, the University Committee (UC) of the Senate decides to request a short course to be regulated at the beginning of 1973. This course is to be offered before lectures begin and concentrate on orienting instructors to university didactics and the use of aids and lectures. During the course, particulars should be dealt with regarding the aids which can be supplied by the University, as well as their use and availability. The committee also is requested to include in the program the demonstration of a few lectures of differing natures by expert instructors⁽¹⁶⁾. To pay heed to the request of the UC of the Senate, it is requested that the Department of Didactic Pedagogics offer a draft program about all aspects of importance for such a course for submission to the committee ⁽¹⁷⁾.

On instructions from the chair of the Van der Stoep Committee (also then the Head of the Department of Didactic Pedagogics and Subject Didactics), Dr. W. J. Louw (later Professor) submits a program for the Committee's consideration. At its meeting of 24 July 1972, the committee accepts the proposal and the program is transmitted to the Senate for approval^{*} (18).

The UC of the Senate gives its expressed blessings to the orientation course and the first Course for Instructors is offered by the University of Pretoria during February 1973. This Course for Instructors lays the foundation for subsequent yearly offerings of the course. Some aspects of the first course are maintained, and more goal-directed themes are added until today, a solid service is provided, especially to new instructors.

During December of 1972, Prof. Van der Stoep, in collaboration with members of the Faculty of Education, and other interested instructors, organizes and pilots the first comprehensive orientation program for new first year students in February 1973. In this task, he also is assisted by Dr. W. J. Louw (at that time the secondary head of the Student Counseling Services). With the necessary changes and modifications, the orientation course is still offered today, and, in all respects, it is viewed as an important attempt by the University to effectively link up with new first year students. Although the design and presentation of the orientation program is

not strongly addressed in the charge of the Van der Stoep Committee, the authorities request Prof. Van der Stoep to also exert and make available to the University his knowledge and experience here.

It is during its meeting of 30 April 1973 that the committee awaits the ruling of the Council about the request from the Senate to establish a Student services Bureau: should the Council choose to accept the Senate's recommendation, then this would be the last meeting of the committee because the division of Planning University Teaching of the SSB takes over the activities of the Committee.

With the dissolution of the permanent Senate Committee concerning Academic Teaching and Aids (Van der Stoep Committee), an end comes to an important era in the history of tertiary teaching at the University of Pretoria. It is difficult, within the space of this paper, to fully evaluate the committee's achievements. The problem is that, on the one hand, it is difficult to eliminate some aspects because then a skewed image of the contributions can be formed and, on the other hand, the foundation the committee lays, is still being realized in generally more sensitive attitudes toward university didactics and, particularly, in the crystallizing of scientific research directed to university didactics.

The charges of the Van der Stoep Committee, and the old Student Counseling Service are taken over by the new Student Services Bureau since its establishment in 1973. The Student Services Bureau is part of the general academic administration of the University and is directly under the jurisdiction of the (Academic) Registrar. Under the lead of its director, the SSB is organized into two divisions, a Counseling Service, and a Division of Planning University Teaching. The idea is that the problems of individual students (personality, social, study, and other problems) can be intercepted by the Division of Counseling. However, where such problems arise from or suggest a teaching problem, the problem is jointly handled with the Division of Planning University Teaching. The latter also provides information to the authorities about various aspects of teaching which can help them in their planning of teaching. Thus, the SSB mainly is responsible for intercepting the

individual problems of students, and the teaching problems of instructors and, where possible, to give expert guidance.

With the establishment of the SSB, the University has created the needed machinery to investigate problems of studying and teaching in scientific ways, and to provide the authorities with the needed information to make suitable recommendations regarding teaching policies. In this way, one of the most important recommendations of the Van der Stoep Committee has been realized, i.e., that a scientifically accountable body directly study matters regarding the terrain of teaching and submit, thorough reports to the authorities, so that effective times can be experienced.

After the SSB is established in 1973, and the charges of the Van der Stoep committee are placed on a new foundation, additional needs of instructors are identified, i.e., a course in tertiary didactics directed to improving instructional practice. The annual Instructor Orientation courses are attended because of the need for a general didactic orientation for new instructors who have no teaching experience; however, this does not fulfill the need for a more comprehensive course which has the practical aspects of teaching in mind.

During 1976, the Council for the Faculty of Education orders that a part-time Diploma in Tertiary Teaching be established at the beginning of 1977. The broad guidelines for establishing the diploma, taken up in this order amounts to offering, as far as possible, a survey of all the practical aspects of university teaching; the training should take place over two semesters; admittance to the diploma require a recognized university degree, or equivalent training, as determined by the Senate, and; the Department of Didactic Pedagogics and Subject Didactics, in collaboration with other concerned academic departments, must compile and offer the training. This task is assigned to Professors F. van der Stoep and W. J. Louw by the Faculty of Education, and after the particulars of the diploma are officially approved, the Tertiary Teaching Diploma is piloted in 1977. The point of departure for compiling the courses is a systematic analysis of the didactic situation. The following question forms the basis for structuring the courses: What does a lecturer do when he/she lectures? The point of departure is

determined by this question, and it serves as the basis for describing the essentials and structures of university teaching. Equally relevant questions asked are, e.g., why does a lecturer act in a particular way? How does he/she act? What does he/she use in his/her activities? How does he/she know when he/she has lectured effectively? How does he/she harmonize his/her lecturing activities with the learner's activities, etc.?

These questions, and the reductions flowing from them lead to the identification of particular areas of study, which lead to the basis for delimiting the various subjects constituting the courses, e.g., Didactics, to ask and answer the "what" question, Tertiary Subject Teaching, to ask and answer the "how" question, Speech Training and Teaching Aids and Technology, to ask and answer the "what to use" question, Student Orienting Practice, to understand the student's situation, etc.

Because of the nature of the courses, the faculty decides, where possible, to offer interdisciplinary courses. The Department of Didactics and Subject Didactics form the core of the courses, but other academic departments, such as The Departments of Economics, Political Science, and International Politics, and Library Science, as well as other faculties, such as Law and the Student's Services Bureau offer certain aspects of the training (19).

The first enrollment for the Tertiary Teaching Diploma is 10 candidates: Prof. G. P. R. von Willich (Faculty of Engineering), Prof. M. C. Boshoff (Head, Department of Library Science), Dr. J. Britz (Faculty of Dentistry), Mrs. W. M. Botha (Department of Library Science), Miss A. M. E. Britz (School of Arts, Music and Ballet), Mrs. A. Hugo (College of Radiography), Miss S. Rohrig (College of Radiography), Mr. C. J. Smit (Pretoria Technicon), Mr. J. J. Sauer (Department of Zoology), and Mr. W. D. Styn (Department of Physics). Of the 10 candidates, six related to the university, and of the six, four, at different times, subsequently give demonstrations at the yearly Lecturer-Orientation Course. Mrs. Botha offers for the subsequent two years an important module in Didactics: the integration of the library into subject teaching.

The lessons learned from this first offering of the Tertiary Teaching diploma necessarily has adjustments and adaptations, consequently. The most important of these is the resequencing of the semester courses and modules in the different subjects, and the greater use of video recordings of the candidates for training aims.

In 1978, the enrollment increases to 11: Dr. M. F. G. Dannheimer (Faculty of Dentistry), Dr. J. C. G. Slabbert (now Professor of Dentistry at Witwatersrand University), Mr. P. P. Alberts (Personnel Director), Lt. P. A. Brynard (Penal Service), Mrs. M. Hattingh (College of Radiography, H. F. Verwoerd Hospital), Mr. K-D. C. O. Garlipp (Faculty of Engineering), Mr. G. J. Greeff (Pretoria Technicon), Mr. J. J. Murphy (Atomic Energy Council), Mrs. A. M. J. Snyman (Radiography Lecturer, Ga-Rankuwa Hospital), Mrs. N. B. Viljoen (College of Radiography, H. F. Verwoerd Hospital) and Mrs. T. van der Westhuizen (Radiography College). Of the 11 candidates, three are directly connected with the university, and three are part-time. Also in 1978, the experience leads to modifications, but of a smaller degree.

The enrollment in 1979 increases to 20: The possible reason for this is that the courses have stabilized and the feedback from those passing the courses is positive. The candidates for 1979 are: Prof. R. G. Bohmer (Department of Chemistry), Mr. P. J. Bosch (Department of Mathematics), Mr. W. A. F. Ceronio (Department of Plastic Arts), Mr. C. du Plooy (Technical Division), Mrs. T. Holtzhausen (Faculty of Dentistry), Dr. S. S. Lombard (Faculty of Veterinary Medicine), Mrs. C. R. Mulder (MEDUSA), Dr. M. S. Nel (Faculty of Dentistry), Miss A. Pretorius (Hebron Teachers College), Dr. F. Reyers (Faculty of Veterinary Medicine), Dr. B. Scherman (Faculty of Dentistry), Prof. P. J. Schoeman (Faculty of Dentistry and former dean), Miss A. C. F. Steinberg (Occupational therapist, Weskoppies Hospital), Miss R. Taylor (Faculty of Dentistry), Dr. S. J. Terblanche (Faculty of Plastic Arts), Dr. P. A. van Brakel (Department of Library Science), Miss A. C. van der Linde (Department of Afrikaans), Dr. A. E. A. van der Merwe (Faculty of Dentistry), Mrs. A. Wycherley (College of Physiotherapy), Mrs. G. M. Zaayman (College of Radiography). It is obvious that 15 of the 20 candidates are connected directly with the university, while two are part-time.

During 1979, the Senate requests that the program be offered so that a candidate could spread his/her study over two years, that the subjects be offered in modules so that interested lecturers could attend only certain aspects of the course or subject(s) and, further, to determine the possibility of offering the course on Saturday mornings (20). To fulfill the first request, the course was greatly restructured: it is divided into semester courses, i.e., Didactics, both semesters; Tertiary Subject Teaching, both semesters; Learning Theory, first semester; Speech Training, first semester; Teaching Aids, first semester; Student Orientation Practice, second semester and Tertiary Educational Administration, second semester. Each semester course also is divided into modules and, in the planning, dates and times for offering the modules are worked out.

Regarding the last request, all the lecturers at the University are requested to indicate if offering the diploma courses on Saturday mornings is a choice. Seventeen lecturers respond and only 4 vote for Saturday mornings.

This year, there are 22 candidates for the diploma, two of which spread their study over two years. To date, there have been no requests or demands to attend the modules. The consensus of the candidates is that the modules and the subjects form an integrated whole and, therefore, it is more desirable for them to enroll in each course.

Interesting aspects of the diploma courses is that from 1978, the yearly lecturer orientation course serves as an introduction to the diploma courses. One would think that a newly appointed lecturer would take the opportunity to enroll for the diploma. However, this is not the case. Most candidates are experienced lecturers with demonstrated lecturing skills and abilities. One can speculate about this apparent paradox, but it appears as if the new lecturers are more interested in the problems of their own mastery of the teaching contents, while experienced lectures are more interested in the problems of teaching as such (21).

An additional interesting aspect of the enrollment is that most lecturers came from the natural and applied sciences and,

especially, from the Faculty of Dentistry, Plastic Arts, Engineering, Mathematics, the Natural Sciences, Economics, and Political Science. Very few candidates are from Letters and Philosophy and, to date, not one candidate is from Theology. Possibly there is somewhere in this phenomenon something of importance, but to speculate what this is would be difficult and risky to try!

With the establishment of the Tertiary Teaching Diploma in 1977, interest also arises about scientifically investigating university didactics. In 1977, the first candidate enrolled for the D. Ed. in Tertiary Didactics. He is Prof. Dr. F. J. Engelbrecht, Head of the Department of Philosophy, and now Dean, Faculty of Letters and Philosophy, University of the North. Prof. Engelbrecht passed his doctoral examination in 1978, after fulfilling all the requirements of the Faculty of Education. His dissertation deals with a metaleptic (i.e., historical) didactic study of the contemporary university. After him, there are five other candidates who enrolled in the D. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics), i.e., Prof. Dr. K. de Clerk, Department of Chemistry, University of Pretoria; Prof. Dr. P. van Z. Bekker, Department of Chemistry, University of Pretoria; Prof. Dr. C. Muller, Department of English, University of the North; Dr. C. A. van der Merwe, Head, University Teacher Planning Division, Student's Services Bureau, University of Pretoria and Mr. H. C. Mentz, senior lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Pretoria.

At this time (1980), there also is one candidate enrolled for the M. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics), i.e., J. D. V. Terblanche, formerly Rector, Pretoria Teachers College, and presently Assistant Director, Conditions of Service and Personnel Provisions, Transvaal Department of Education. Mr. Terblanche's in progress study deals with a theme which should be of particular importance for tertiary teaching, i.e., the reciprocal recognition of qualifications between universities and teachers colleges.

With the commencement of post-graduate studies in Tertiary Didactics, another important facet of the history of the University of Pretoria is ushered in. How this development, as well as the offering of the Tertiary Teaching Diploma, impacts the subsequent organization of the Faculty of Education, in general, and the Department of Didactic Pedagogics and Subject Didactics, in

particular, only time will tell. What must be stressed here is that the University of Pretoria, by means of the Student's Services Bureau and the Tertiary Teaching Diploma, has created the possibility of studying, in accountably scientific ways, teaching and learning problems and, where possible, to solve them.

Finally, it is indicated that, as far as Tertiary Didactics is concerned, the University of Pretoria follows the policy of a weighing and careful analysis of real didactic needs and bottlenecks, before financial, organizational and academic responsibilities in this regard are negotiated. The wisdom of this policy becomes obvious when the development of Tertiary Teaching in the United States of America, in Europe, and even at certain universities in the Republic of South Africa are studied. Too many universities have created comprehensive and sophisticated techniques and academic machinery which today remains partly or entirely unused. Here there is mention of solutions in search of problems ⁽²²⁾. During the past 50 years, the University of Pretoria has avoided this trap, and what today has been achieved in Tertiary Teaching stands as a landmark in the history of the University of Pretoria.

REFERENCES

1. **Yearbook**, Univeristy of Pretoria, pp. 18-32.
2. Louw, W. J. (1973). Die probleem van die moderne universiteitsonderwys. In *Tertiëre Onderwys*, **Publication Series of SAVBO**, 130, No. 7, 15-28.
3. Van der Stoep, F. (1973). Die opleiding en akademiese studie van die student aan die moderne universiteit. In *Doesentkursus*. **Publication of the University of Pretoria**, No. 80.
4. Jaarverslag [annual report] van die Senaatskomitee vir Akademiese Onderwysmetodes en Hulpmiddels (S864/68), p 1.
5. Notule (minutes): Senaat: Gewone Vergadering van 5 April 1967.
6. Jaarverslag van die Senaatkomitee vir Akademiese Onderwysmetodes en Hulpmiddels, *ibid*, pp. 1 and 24.
7. Notule: UK van die Senaat: S 178/69.
8. Brief [letter] van die Registrateur (akademies) 1 April 1969.
9. Notule: Senaatkomitee vir Akademiese Onderwysmetodes en Hulpmiddels (S1060/69).

10. Brief van die Sekretaris K. U. H. (Committee of University Heads), 18 August 1969.
11. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S1276/70)
12. Verslag [report]: Werksaamhede van die Komitee in samesprekings met die Registrateur (Akademies) (S640/71).
13. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S639/71).
14. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S956/71).
15. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S1045/71).
16. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S472/72).
17. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S566/72).
18. Notule: Kom. Akad. Onder. en Hulpm. (S1007/72).
19. Louw, W. J. (1979). Staff development programmes: Issues and Models. Paper read at the Staff Development Conference, University of Zululand, June.
20. Notule: Senaat: Gewone vergadering op 1979.
21. Louw, W. J. (1979). *ibid.*
22. Alder, J. (1979). An argument against advocacy. In Third International Congress: EARDHE, Klagenfurt.

SUMMARY

TERTIARY DIDACTICS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA: A HISTORICAL SURVEY

The development of tertiary didactics at the University of Pretoria falls into four main periods: the period prior to 1967; that between 1967 and 1973; the period between 1973 and 1977; and that after 1977.

Prior to 1967, from time to time, the Senate appoints ad hoc committees to go into certain problem areas of teaching at the University and report their findings to the Senate. Aspects like the introduction and use of educational technology, closed-circuit television, etc. are studied. The general recommendation is to take note of the developments, but only introduce them once their didactic worth is determined.

In 1967, the Senate appoints a standing committee, known as the "Committee for Academic Teaching Methods and Teaching Aids",

under the chairmanship of Prof. F. van der Stoep. The charge is "to submit an interim ad hoc report to the Senate and, thereafter, to submit an annual report on all matters concerning university teaching". In accordance with its charge, in 1968 the Van der Stoep Committee organizes a conference for university lecturers on first year student dropouts; presents a demonstration of teaching aids in the same year; does an in-depth didactic evaluation of closed circuit television in 1969; analyzes the uses and possibilities of "core" notes in the same year; convenes a conference on problems of university teaching in 1971; and in 1973 offers the first university instructors' orientation program. These are only some of the numerous topics examined by the Van der Stoep Committee, but its main achievement is in the fact that it establishes the basis for university didactics, generally, and for the structuring of the Student Services Bureau, specifically.

In July 1973, the Student Services Bureau is established and organized for two main interrelated activities: on the one hand, an organization to counsel students with study, personal, social, and other problems and, on the other hand, an organization to study university teaching problems and factors necessary to formulate teaching policy. The latter organization, University Teaching Planning, takes over the function of the Van der Stoep Committee. Thus, in establishing the Student Services Bureau, the University creates an organization to systematically and scientifically study aspects of university teaching.

In 1977, the Tertiary Education Diploma is introduced for the first time with the aim to train university teachers in the practice of teaching at a university. The introduction of this diploma leads to academic interest in university didactics, to the extent that six candidates have subsequently enrolled for the D. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics), and one candidate for the M. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics) degrees.

An analysis of the development of tertiary teaching at the University of Pretoria from 1930 to 1980 indicates that progress and innovation come slowly but effectively. In this way, the University of Pretoria avoids the pitfall of creating didactic solutions in search of problems.

