

TERTIARY DIDACTICS*

W. J. Louw

As one leafs through the University Yearbooks and studies them from an 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 were enrolled in six faculties, namely, Letters and Sciences, Law, Mathematics and Natural Science, Agricultural Sciences, Business and Public Administration (what later become the Faculty of Economics and Political Science) and Veterinary Science. In 1929 the establishment of courses in Architecture were begun.⁽¹⁾

The general nature of teaching in the 1930's was 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 faculty of which Law, Education, Theology (A and B), Veterinary Science, Medicine, Dentistry and Engineering mainly are attuned to vocational preparation and training. Statistics emphasize this tendency: in 1972 of all newly enrolled first-year students, 77% were 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 has to cautiously use its relationship with the organized professions and especially their desires in teaching (regarding both content and form). These

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

matters remain problematic and also 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 has identified the following ways of attaining this latter aim: orienting a student regarding the nature and methods of the science he studies; orienting a student regarding areas of knowledge peripheral to his science to achieve an integration; orienting a student regarding the relationship between the particular scientific knowledge and his future professional activities, and, unifying scientific and professional study in forming a student.

The University was 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 was the ad hoc Senate committee under the chairmanship of Prof. G. Cronje and later Prof. B. F. Nel which addressed itself to particular problems.⁽⁴⁾ In 1950 there were eight Faculty (Education was established in 1937 and Medicine in 1943) with a total student enrollment of 3,611. This was also the period of the rise of all kinds of teaching aids of greater or lesser technological and electronic sophistication and the Senate committee was 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, were delegated to attend the "First National Conference on Teaching Machines and Programmed Instruction" in Johannesburg. On the basis of the Du Plessis and Meerkotter report the committee did not recommend the large-scale purchase of teaching and learning machines. The decision was to first determine what the didactic possibilities were of such machines. With this, the Nel Committee also took a general focus on defining instructional-'hardware' which later was inherited by the Van der Stoep Committee; that is, as far as instructional innovations are concerned, it is prudent to determine thoroughly what their actual positive teaching possibilities are before expenditures and internal reorganization are begun and undertaken.

In 1967 at its usual meeting on 5 April, the Senate decided to establish a standing Senate Committee to go into appropriate matters regarding university teaching and to report back to the Senate. The Committee became 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 consisted 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 had 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 convened a conference for the 15th and 16th of February, 1968 to consider first year attrition. In its report, the Committee referred to two matters addressed at the conference and that would have important consequences for the University: first, penetrating scientific research has to 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 formed 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 was also active in 1968 and on 16, 17 and 18 October it arranged a demonstration of teaching aids on Campus and gave the Senate a report on various aspects of university teaching. In 1969, on order from the Senate, the Committee piloted a study of the proper use of Closed-Circuit Television (C.C.T.V.) in teaching.⁽⁷⁾ In April 1969, the Committee also received 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 formed the basis for the University's policy regarding the dictation method, that for the most part had been abolished, and of providing core notes to students. The duplication division had to 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 assigned Prof. L. van Biljon to do a report on this matter. After visiting the U.S.A. and Europe, Prof. Van Biljon presented his report on 9 December 1969. Over and above recommendations of a technical nature, Prof. Van Biljon found it didactically desirable to establish C.C.T.V. His recommendations were 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 experienced problems in implementing its recommendations regarding university teaching. On 3 October 1969 the committee chairman and other department chairmen had 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 was 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 was 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 formed the foundation for the organization and continuation of the University's teaching policy.

At this time, the University of Pretoria did 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) convened a meeting of an ad hoc committee

concerning Research on University Problems. Prof. van der Stoep was delegated to represent the University of Pretoria.⁽¹⁰⁾ During this meeting the ad hoc committee proposed that the CUH appoint a standing committee for coordinating and improving research on problems of university teaching. Such a committee was established and exists today under the chairmanship of Prof. E. Marais, Rector, University of Port Elizabeth. In 1978 this committee held a national symposium on problems of university teaching where the problems of the passage from school to university were thoroughly discussed. After the symposium ended, the CUH requested 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 continued its good work and organized another teaching aids demonstration for 1971 but this time it was limited to closed-circuit television.⁽¹¹⁾ In 1970, a conference for instructors was also held on bottlenecks in university teaching and an extensive report was presented where the most important problems were focused on and certain recommendations were made.

Clearly, it was from the formal agendas of the Van der Stoep Committee that the committee gradually realized its recommendations on matters concerning general university teaching were not being considered further in favorable ways or implemented.⁽¹²⁾ Particularly, the committee identified four important problems, namely, the scope of the committee's work; the lack of reactions to the committee's recommendations; the handicaps the University of Pretoria had with respect to modern teaching aids and the need for a department/bureau/etc. to undertake systematic research. These matters were discussed thoroughly with the (Academic) Registrar and the committee was assured that the authorities would be fully informed of the need for comprehensive research. The registrar also indicated 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 had informed the committee

that the University, in 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 would be to make available systematic scientific particulars of matters relating to university teaching, the structure and organization of which would be determined later. At the same time, permission was given for installing small television sets where funds are available.

In 1971 it also was 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 was never accepted and the committee kept its name until its dissolution. During this period, the committee became the center to which all problems regarding university teaching and related matters were channeled. In the same year, the Senate for the first time proposed 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 decided that a course of a largely practical nature be instituted that 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 of the practical aspects of university teaching within which methodology, chalkboard work, aids, etc. are discussed. It was further decided that new instructors who do not possess a teaching qualification be required to attend the course. This decision was made known to the authorities and they enthusiastically awaited its implementation. Because the establishment of the Student Services Bureau (SSB) was still pending and the idea was proposed that the SSB also be responsible for regulating and offering courses in university didactics for instructors, the recommendation of the Senate was temporarily set aside. This recommendation by the Senate was later implemented and saw 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 decided to request a short course to be regulated at the beginning of 1973. This course was to be offered before lectures began 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 that can be supplied by the University as well as their use and availability. The committee also was requested to include in the program the demonstrate of a few lectures of differing natures by expert instructors.⁽¹⁶⁾ To pay heed to the request of the UC of the Senate, it was 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) submitted a program for the Committee's consideration. At its meeting of 24 July 1972. the committee accepted the proposal and the program was transmitted to the Senate for approval.^{*18)}

The UC of the Senate gave its expressed blessings to the orientation course and the first Course for Instructors was offered by the University of Pretoria during February 1973. This Course for Instructors laid the foundation for subsequent yearly offerings of the course. Some aspects of the first course were maintained and more goal-directed themes were 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, organized and piloted the first comprehensive orientation program for new first year students in February 1973. In this task he also was 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 was not strongly addressed in the charge of the Van der Stoep Committee, the authorities requested Prof. Van der Stoep to also exert and make available to the University his knowledge and experience here.

It was during its meeting of 30 April 1973 that the committee awaited 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 would take 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 had come 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 laid still is being realized in generally more sensitive attitudes toward university didactics and in particular in the crystallizing of scientific research directed to university didactics.

The charges of the Van der Stoep Committee and the old Student Counseling Service have been 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 that 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 had 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 had been realized, namely, 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 was established in 1973 and the charges of the Van der Stoep committee were placed on a new foundation, additional needs of instructors were identified, namely, a course in tertiary didactics directed to improving instructional practice. The annual Instructor Orientation courses were attended because of the need for a general didactic orientation for new instructors who had no teaching experience; however, this does not fulfill the need for a more comprehensive course that has the practical aspects of teaching in mind.

During 1976 the Council for the Faculty of Education ordered 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 amounted to offering, as far as possible, a survey of all of the practical aspects of university teaching; the training should take place over two semesters; admittance to the diploma required 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, had to compile and offer the training. This task was assigned to Professors F. van der Stoep and W. J. Louw by the Faculty of Education and after the particulars of the diploma were officially approved, the Tertiary Teaching Diploma was piloted in 1977. The point of departure for compiling the courses was a systematic analysis of the didactic situation. The following question formed the basis for structuring the courses: What does a lecturer do when he lectures? The point of departure was determined by this question and it served as the basis for describing the essentials and structures of university teaching. Equally relevant questions asked were, e.g., why does a lecturer act in a particular way? How does he act? What does he use in his activities? How does he know when he has

lectured effectively? How does he harmonize his lecturing activities with the learner's activities?, etc.

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

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

The first enrollment for the Tertiary Teaching Diploma was 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 were connected with the university and of the six, four at different times subsequently gave demonstrations at the yearly Lecturer-Orientation Course. Mrs. Botha offered 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 had adjustments and adaptations as a consequence. The most important of these was the re-sequencing 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 increased 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 led to modifications but of a smaller degree.

The enrollment in 1979 increased to 20: The possible reason for this is that the courses had stabilized and the feedback from those passing the courses was positive. The candidates for 1979 were: 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 were connected directly with the university while two were part-time.

During 1979 the Senate requested that the program be offered so that a candidate could spread his 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 re-structured: it was divided into semester courses, namely, 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 was divided into modules and in the planning dates and times for offering the modules were worked out.

Regarding the last request, all of the lecturers at the University were requested to indicate if offering the diploma courses on Saturday mornings was a choice. Seventeen lecturers responded and only 4 voted for Saturday mornings.

This year 22 candidates enrolled 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 general consensus of the candidates was that the modules and the subjects form an integrated whole and therefore it is more desirable for them to enroll in each course as a whole.

Interesting aspects of the diploma courses is that from 1978 the yearly lecturer orientation course served 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 was not the case. The majority of candidates were experienced lecturers with demonstrated lecturing skills and abilities. One can speculate about this apparent paradox but it appears as if the new lecturers were more interested in the problems of their own mastery of the teaching contents while experienced lecturers were more interested in the problems of teaching, as such.⁽²¹⁾

An additional interesting aspect of the enrollment is that the majority of 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 were from Letters and Philosophy and to date not one candidate was 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 arose about scientifically investigating university didactics. In 1977 the first candidate enrolled for the D. Ed. in Tertiary Didactics. He was 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 of the requirements of the Faculty of Education. His dissertation dealt with a metabletic (i.e., historical) didactic study of the contemporary university. After him there were five other candidates who enrolled in the D. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics), namely: 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 the moment (1980) there also is one candidate enrolled for the M. Ed. (Tertiary Didactics), namely, 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 that should be of particular importance for tertiary teaching, namely, 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 will impact 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 needs to be stressed here is that the University of Pretoria, by means of the Student's Services Bureau and the Tertiary Teaching Diploma, has created to 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 followed the policy of a weighing and careful analysis of real didactic needs and bottlenecks before financial, organizational and academic responsibilities in this regard were negotiated. The wisdom of this policy became 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 were studied. Too many universities had 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⁾ In 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]: Werkzaamhede 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 appointed 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. were studied. The general recommendation was to take note of the developments but only introduce them once their didactic worth was determined.

In 1967 the Senate appointed 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 was: "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 organized a conference for university lecturers on first year student dropouts; presented a demonstration of teaching aids in the same year; did an in-depth didactic evaluation of closed circuit television in 1969; analyzed the uses and possibilities of "core" notes in the same year; convened a conference on problems of university teaching in 1971; and in 1973 offered the first university instructor's orientation program. These are only some of the numerous topics examined by the Van der Stoep Committee, but its main achievement lies in the fact that it established the basis for university didactics generally and for the structuring of the Student Services Bureau specifically.

In July 1973 the Student Services Bureau was 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, took over the function of the Van der Stoep Committee. Thus, in establishing the Student Services Bureau, the University created an organization to systematically and scientifically study aspects of university teaching.

In 1977 the Tertiary Education Diploma was 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 led 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 came slowly but effectively. In this way the University of Pretoria avoided the pitfall of creating didactic solutions in search of problems.