

Adequacy of Promoting Excellence in Teaching (PET) Programme in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria

Author's Details:

⁽¹⁾Yetunde Adedoyin Ajibade (ORCID: 0000-0003-3556-6381)

Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria,

⁽²⁾Moruf Ademola Adeleke (ORCID: 0000-0003-1718-7230)

Department of Science and Technology Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria,

⁽³⁾Oyebode Stephen Oyetoro (ORCID: 0000-0002-7515-6806)¹

Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria,

Abstract

Sustainable training programmes must attain prior stated objectives and maximise the resources invested in them. The Promoting Excellence in Teaching (PET) programme which was designed to provide pedagogical training for newly recruited academic staff in Obafemi Awolowo University is one that has faced extinction tendencies on account of a number of factors chief amongst which is funding. The continued funding of the programme must therefore be justified. It is with this background that this study was carried out to: assess the adequacy of the objectives of the programme; and examine the adequacy of the learning experiences provided by the programme. The study utilised the descriptive survey design involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and analyses. The sample comprised 125 lecturers from 13 faculties of the University who had participated in the first three training sessions of the programme. The results showed that the participants: perceived the objectives to be adequate albeit with some modifications; and assessed the learning experiences provided by the programme to be suitable and adequate. The implications of these findings for the implementation of similar programmes were discussed.

Keywords: Assessment, evaluation, higher education, teaching, training and pedagogical skills

1. Introduction

The trajectory of the teaching profession shows that effective teaching is expected to be measured nowadays, across all levels of education, by the quality of learning rather than teaching. This suggests that instructional delivery has moved more towards learning-centred/learner-centred than teacher-centred approach. However, literature has established that across countries, learning-centred innovations made are more pronounced at the lower than higher level of education and more in certain parts of the world than in others. For example, [1] postulates that American educators have noted that in comparison to primary and secondary school teachers, most college and university professors receive minimal or no training in educational theory and methodology. Such a lack of focus on teaching-learning innovations has probably accounted for the delay in introducing training in methods and techniques of teaching or pedagogical content to higher education teaching staff in both developed and developing countries. Continued existence of gaps in pedagogical training among teachers in colleges and universities is still being discussed by researchers [2], [3], [4].

Traditionally, teaching in the university is woven around premium significance placed on delivery of cognitive academic contents over and above other contents in the different disciplines. The nature of university education is such that a handful of university products return to become lecturers in the same system. These lecturers, trained with emphasis on cognitive contents, usually end up with the practice of focusing on cognitive contents themselves. Though, such practice has produced renowned experts in different fields of study, the fact that they

¹ Corresponding Author

lack appropriate pedagogical content knowledge to deliver instruction would continue to be a source of concern as the other aspects of learning, such as the affective and psycho-motor, may not be given due attention. [5] buttresses this opinion with the assertion that professors who do not have an understanding of pedagogy may think about the content students should learn, but not the cognitive capabilities they should develop. It is however difficult to blame such professors or lecturers as they are totally oblivious that something more than content knowledge is required of them as university teachers who are meant to contribute maximally to students' all-round development at the highest educational echelon. This has been the practice for decades and the need to encourage a paradigm shift has become expedient.

[6] observes that the task of the teacher in higher education has many dimensions. These include provision of a broad context of knowledge within which students can locate and understand the content of their more specific studies; creation of a learning environment in which students are encouraged to think carefully and critically; constantly monitoring and reflecting on the processes of teaching and student understanding; and helping students to achieve their own aims, among others. These are not known to be easy tasks particularly for lecturers who do not have training in education. To confirm this, [4] establish the fact that students often perceive Higher Education Institution (HEI) teachers' lack of pedagogical training when they give less attention to students' engagement. There is little wonder therefore, that calls continue to be made, we dare say now more than before, for increased efforts in developing the pedagogical skills of university lecturers.

On the account of this, universities in developed countries appear to have done the right thing by starting to address this lapse using quality measures whereas this cannot be said about universities in developing countries such as Nigeria. [7] observe that students, across faculties, are satisfied with the subject matter knowledge of their lecturers but only those in the Faculty of Education find their lecturers' pedagogical knowledge satisfactory. [8] captures the situation appropriately by suggesting that regardless of size and ownership (public or private), it is important that all post-secondary institutions develop a reputation for excellence in teaching. Baik et al. (2015) in [4] extend this discourse on the need for proper pedagogical training by stating that teachers without proper pedagogical training can hardly facilitate participatory teaching approaches. In responding to this challenge, some universities in developed countries started devising means of re-orientating lecturers in disciplines other than education, in the art and science of teaching to ensure that teaching is properly done and learning actually takes place. In 2012, sequel to research efforts by some teacher educators [7], [9] Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, blazed the trail by introducing a quality teaching enhancement programme tagged "Promoting Excellence in Teaching" (PET). Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife became one of the first, if not the very first, in Nigeria to provide an avenue for lecturers of the University to be trained in the strategies of instructional preparation, delivery and evaluation for the purpose of bringing about effective teaching.

The "Promoting Excellence in Teaching" (PET) programme was approved by the Senate of Obafemi Awolowo University in 2012 and the first edition of the training exercise took place in the 2012/2013 Session. The objectives of the PET programme as presented in its implementation proposal are as follows:

By the end of the programme, lecturers are expected to be able to:

1. plan, design and review the courses they teach and relate such courses to the ecology of the university curriculum;
2. apply a wide range of theories, methods and models of teaching students with emphasis on students' construction of knowledge and negotiation of meaning through more inclusive student involvement;
3. acquire and apply a wide range of evaluation tools, techniques and quality assurance mechanisms;

4. apply modern information techniques to inspire and improve the quality of teaching and learning;
5. acquire and apply knowledge on the sociology and psychology of university students to improve instructional delivery in the university learning environment; and
6. counsel university students by applying basic concepts and principles of guidance and counseling.

Between inception and the time of this study, the training had been held three times covering about 125 (14%) of the staff strength of faculty members of the University; however, not all faculty members were targeted for logistic reasons. Only newly recruited academic staff were focused (though a number of staff who did not fall into this category indicated interest including professors!) across all disciplines and the programme was scheduled to be held during long vacation periods but this was not always possible due to instability in the academic calendar.

PET is a relatively new programme in the University and so much hope and confidence is reposed in it to inject increased quality in the University's academic programme and bring about a university system that is more functional, highly competitive and more global in its operations and outlook. Achievement of this lofty objectives demands that the programme is of high quality and adequacy in terms of its development and the learning experiences provided for the participants. It is therefore expedient to carry out a formative assessment (in line with the dictates of monitoring and evaluation) of a programme that has been in existence for three years. This is considered important particularly as an initial survey (prior to the commencement of PET) found out that lecturers had a positive attitude to receiving pedagogical training irrespective of sex, faculty, academic status, years of experience and previous exposure to education [9]. The present survey is a necessary follow-up that assesses if lecturers' expectations are being or have been met.

2. Problem Statement/Justification

Teaching, research and service have been the hallmarks of university education since its inception. Studies have however shown that, in practice, focus has shifted from this tripod mission to just one – research – with very severe and negative consequences largely evidenced in the quality of student output. The Internet age has once again drawn attention to the importance of teaching in university education as student composition has increased in number and nationality and such an increase requires increased knowledge of pedagogical considerations for maximum results and enhanced quality. Nigeria's National Policy on Education [10] has keyed into this important consideration by including a policy statement on the desirability of all tertiary education teachers to undergo training in pedagogy. However, the social climate found in many universities makes establishment of such innovations difficult. While quality teaching enhancement programmes specifically designed for academics in Nigerian higher institutions, such as the PET programme, have been successfully planned and implemented in developed countries, none was known to be in existence in Nigeria before OAU Senate approved the PET programme. The establishment of PET has been informed by some baseline studies earlier conducted by some members of Faculty of Education of the University [7], [9]. Therefore, assessing the adequacy of the programme in terms of the objectives and implementation process is imperative. In addition, given the fact that effective programme development incorporates monitoring and evaluation, there is no better time than now, after three editions of the programme, to carry out a much-needed assessment which could provide empirical data that would inform its sustainability. The study is expected to provide information on the views of participants of the programme, in its three years of existence, on the suitability of the strategies and criteria that the University utilises in selecting those that participate in the training; and the adequacy of the objectives of the programme. The objectives that have guided this present paper are to: examine the adequacy of the objectives formulated for the programme; and examine the adequacy of the learning experiences (content and instructional resources) provided by the programme.

3. Research Questions

The following questions which emanate from the objectives of the research were answered:

1. What is the participants' assessment of the adequacy of the objectives formulated for the programme?
2. What is the participants' assessment of the adequacy of the learning experiences (content and instructional resources) provided for the programme?

4. Literature Review

University teachers have two traditional central activities which are research and teaching [11] although community service which stands as the third is also very important. Despite the important nature of the two central activities, university teachers are usually not required to possess certificates for teaching. The major feature that shows respect for university lecturers is the demonstration of expertise in their various disciplines [12] whereas the dissemination of the knowledge that reflects the expertise, which is teaching, is not usually celebrated. As time progressed however, the need to improve university teachers' pedagogical skills as part of measures that determine their expertise became a focus especially since they are now required to foster the acquisition of a wide range of transversal, creative, entrepreneurship, science process and functional skills in their students [13], [14].

Arising from this, many societies particularly in the developed world, began to train teachers in pedagogical skills. Countries that were known to begin a compulsory pedagogical training for their university teachers included the UK, Sri Lanka and Norway [15]. [15] note that the training is, on the average, targeted at improving the university teachers' approaches to their students' teaching and learning as well as their general teaching skills. This innovation, which seemed laudable at the inception, lacked adequate evidence to actually determine whether the innovation was productive or not. Nevertheless, the importance of the pedagogical component in the professional development of university teaching staff has continued to be highlighted by different authors [16], [17], [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23] among others. (Cross, 2001; D'Andrea and Gosing, 2005; Fielden, 1998; Graca, 2008; Lueddeke, 2003; Marentič Pozžarnik and Šteh, 2006; Marentič Pozžarnik, 2009; Rosado Pinto, 2008 among others). By and by, several countries introduced or began to plan to introduce mandatory pedagogical training initiatives for higher education teachers [24], [25], [26], [27], [28]. (Hanbury, Prosser, & Rickinson, 2008; Lindberg-Sand & Sonesson, 2008; Stigmar, 2008; Trowler & Bamber, 2005; Weurlander & Stenfors-Hayes, 2008). The initiative has begun to gain more attention and the current consensus seems to be that the effects of pedagogical training are indeed positive but usually quite small [29], [30]. (Stes, De Maeyer, Gijbels, & Petegem, 2012; Trigwell, Caballero Rodriguez, & Han, 2012). This, however, stands to be debated as there are no known experimental studies, which have controlled and measured variables, that can be used to support this claim.

In Africa, Obafemi Awolowo University in Nigeria seemed to be one of, if not the very first university that introduced pedagogical training for its lecturers with Senate approval of "Promoting Excellence in Teaching (PET) in 2012 and the immediate commencement of its implementation in the 2012/2013 Academic Session. The belief of the University in the efficacy of quality teaching in transforming the individual, institution and the society led to this giant initiative. The programme, emanating from the needs of students [7] and lecturers [9], is in tandem with global trends though a majority of such initiatives have been conceived and executed in developed countries. It is of recent that the higher education system in Africa began focusing on pedagogical training for university teachers. This is evident in the submission of [31] that in the African context, quality university education invariably focuses on student admission standards, lecturers' academic qualifications, rigorous examination protocols, degree programme requirements, course content and availability of laboratory

and classroom facilities. Little or no attention is paid to pedagogy, which is left entirely to the discretion of lecturers.

In redressing this gap, Ehindero and Ajibade [7] opine that

There is a need...to introduce a Teaching Improvement Programme (TIP) to rectify some of the observed deficiencies in lecturers' pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). Such a program would draw from the foundation courses in education, curriculum studies and classroom methodology. The TIP would serve to complement lecturers' subject matter knowledge in the sociology and psychology of the present crop of undergraduates. The Faculty of Education should be empowered to develop such a program which can then be used to introduce and/or re-introduce lecturers to the emerging new ideas of pedagogy in a way that would reconcile them with the realities of classroom teaching in the twenty-first century (p.8).

The recommendation of [7] and [9] that led to the development of PET is partly based on their findings. One is which is that university teachers had a positive attitude to and opinion of pedagogical skills training and were willing to participate in a pedagogical skills training if and when the university mounted one. It is expedient therefore, that an assessment of the relevance of the programme is made now that it has been developed and its implementation has started. This, has become the usual practice wherever and whenever such a programme is implemented. For instance, [32] evaluated the Makerere University, Uganda, Short Professional Development Programmes on pedagogical training from 2006-2010. Findings of the study revealed that staff appreciated the workshop methodology, the co-teaching approach and the sharing of experiences. Some challenges were also identified through the study. The challenges highlighted include the timing of training sessions and inability to implement what was learnt due to institutional constraints. [3] in their own evaluative study of a pedagogical skills training programme for teachers in Adama Science and Technology University, Ethiopia, also reported positive effects on the participants' teaching skills in using lesson planning, active learning, continuous assessment and classroom management. The challenges of the programme as reported by the participants include redundancy of concepts, long duration of the training, large class size, lack of materials and facilities, lack of motivation and inability to implement fully what was learnt from the training. It is expected that the results obtained from these evaluation exercises would have far-reaching implications for improving the efficacy and effectiveness of similar programmes.

5. Methodology

5.1 Study Location

The study was conducted in Obafemi Awolowo University (formerly known as the University of Ife), Ile-Ife, Osun State, located in the Southwestern part of Nigeria. Obafemi Awolowo University is a Federal Government institution of higher learning established in 1962 in the ancient town of Ile-Ife. Ife, considered to be the origin of the Yoruba race, is famous as an ancient civilisation and the home of the museum which contains the renowned Ife heads and numerous ancient artefacts of the Yoruba race. The University which took off with five faculties at its inception in 1962 with an enrolment of 244 students now has 13 faculties with a student population of not less than 30,000 and an academic staff strength of about 1,500. The mission of the University is to create a teaching and learning community for imparting appropriate skills and knowledge, behaviour and attitude; advance frontiers of knowledge that are relevant to national and global development; engender a sense of selfless public service; and promote and nurture the African culture and tradition.

5.2 Study Design

The study adopted the descriptive survey design involving both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods and analyses. The quantitative aspect employed a cross-sectional survey design using structured

questionnaire to collect primary data. The qualitative technique involved conducting in-depth interview and focus group discussion sessions.

5.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

The study population comprised 125 lecturers who had participated in the training in the last three exercises of the programme from the 13 faculties in the University. They completed the administered instrument, participated in the focused group discussion (FGD) and in-depth interview (IDI) sessions.

5.4 Data Collection

Quantitative data were obtained from the questionnaire which was administered to the identified participants while qualitative data were obtained from the in-depth interview (IDI) and focus group discussion (FGD) sessions. Micro-teaching sessions were also organised for 12 participants, about 10% of the study population. Twenty-five participants, about 20% of the study population and half of the 48 participants initially targeted for the IDI and FGD sessions using proportionate sampling eventually supplied information using convenience sampling technique as it was near impossible to get lecturers to participate in these sessions due to their very busy schedules. There were four FGD and IDI sessions in all. The sessions were appropriately captured for effective qualitative analysis which was done at the completion of session interactions.

5.5 Instrument

The Perception of Participants about the Academic and Professional Relevance of the Promoting Excellence in Teaching Programme Questionnaire (PPAPR-PET-Q1) and an interview guide was utilised for the present study. The PPAPR-PET-Q1 has three sections. Section A elicited information on the personal data of the respondents. Information requested in this section include gender, age and time of participation in the PET programme. Section B is a five-point Likert-type scale viz: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), Strongly Disagree (SD) and U (Undecided). The categories were assigned 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 respectively for analysis purposes. It elicited responses on the adequacy of programme objectives as well as teaching and learning activities including their organisation. Sample items in this section include: “I had enough opportunities to practice the skills being promoted during the training programme”; “The training programme is geared towards my skills development as a lecturer” and “The mix of presentation versus activities in the training was very suitable”. The reliability of the items in this section was established using Cronbach alpha with a value of 0.85. Section C with an open-ended format required participants to assess the overall adequacy of the set objectives for the PET programme.

5.6 Procedure for Data Analysis

The process of analysing the qualitative data analysis that were gathered in the study started with editing of the field notes at the end of data collection. It also involved close reading and interpretation of participants’ narratives, reflecting on the study purpose, and using memos to keep track of ideas. Subsequently, significant statements were assigned codes and re-coded iteratively into categories. Emerging themes from the perspectives of participants were integrated into respective domains in line with the study objectives for further analysis and discussion. Quantitative analysis of data that emanated from the study was undertaken using frequency counts and percentages.

6. Results and Discussion of Findings

6.1 Research question one: What is the participants’ assessment of the adequacy of the objectives formulated for the programme?

In order to answer this question, respondents were required to respond to an open-ended question: “On the overall, to what extent do you consider the set objectives of the PET programme adequate?” The responses were analysed qualitatively. Samples of the responses obtained are as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Participants’ responses to the assessment of the overall adequacy of the objectives set for the PET programme

N=25			
S/n	Responses	Frequency	Some reasons provided for the level of assessment
1.	Very Adequate	7	I consider the objectives very adequate. This is because they cover the formulation and the presentation of knowledge as well as deal with issues that may arise from the psychological and sociological contexts of the students.
2.	Highly Adequate	1	Nil
3.	Strongly Adequate	2	Nil
4.	To a very high extent	1	Nil
5.	To a very large extent	1	Nil
6.	To a large extent	3	Nil
7.	Moderately Adequate	2	Nil
8.	Adequate	4	Overall, I think the above stated objectives are adequate for the PET programme. To quantify it, I think above 70%
9.	Inadequate	1	I think the current objectives can be reviewed maybe when the design of the course is being reviewed to include the concept of teaching students to be relevant for the current economic market.
10.	Very important	1	They will improve the lecturers’ output with respect to teaching, learning and counselling of the students, and also enhance lecturers personal research and development.
11.	Good	1	Nil
12.	Neutral	1	There is a need for a scaling up of the objectives to capture the peculiarities of some departments.

Source: Field Survey, 2019

From the responses presented in Table 1, it can be deduced that the respondents considered the formulated objectives for the programme to be adequate except objective six (counsel university students applying basic concepts and principles of guidance and counseling). Reasons given for inadequacy include but are not limited to the following:

This should be the exclusive role of professionals not all lecturers

Not all academics are skilled in guidance and counseling

Counseling students especially the opposite sex may be misinterpreted for sex-for-marks

Counseling should have practical sessions; this is lacking in the PET training

The respondents were further asked to state other objectives they would want the training programme to address. The responses obtained include:

interaction and collaboration among lecturers teaching the same course

time management and career development

ability to provide learning experiences for students that can help them transform theoretical learning experiences into practice

acquiring more knowledge on handling teacher-students relationship

continuous training of staff

assessing available resources/shortage for each department of the University to make recommendations to the University authorities

how the University will give grants and scholarships to lecturers to enhance effective teaching

including the market relevance not just the ecology of the university curriculum

demonstrating high sense of professionalism in teaching

further addressing the issues of transformative learning and teaching in higher education as well as the techniques of teaching large classes in higher institutions

training and retraining of senior members of academic staff

becoming change agents in the University’s different departments and faculties

effective use of ICT in teaching and mentoring of students and maximizing the use of social media in teaching, mentoring and counselling

The assessment provided by the participants indicated that though the programme as organised at the moment met its objectives, there is a need to frequently update and expand the objectives so as to cater for the growing needs of the lecturers.

6.2 Research question two: What is the participants’ assessment of the adequacy of the learning experiences (content and instructional resources) provided for the programme?

In order to answer the question on the adequacy of the learning experiences provided for the programme, frequency count, percentage and mean were obtained for each item in Section B of the administered questionnaire. The results obtained are as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Analysis of responses on the adequacy of teaching and learning experiences of the programme
N=125

S/N	ITEM	SA	A	D	SD	U	Mean
1.	The training programme is geared towards my skills development as a lecturer (1)†	86 (69.9)	35 (28.5)	2 (1.6)	-	-	3.68
2.	The programme introduced me to new strategies of teaching and evaluating student learning (4)	63 (51.6)	54 (44.3)	2 (1.6)	2 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	3.44
3.	The contents of the training met my expectation of the programme (2)	50 (41.3)	67 (55.4)	3 (2.5)	1 (0.8)	-	3.37
4.	I was able to see and hear the presentations clearly (9)	49 (40.2)	68 (55.7)	4 (3.3)	1 (0.8)	-	3.35
5.	The programme made me become familiar with the demands of my work practices as an academic (5)	48 (39.0)	66 (53.7)	6 (4.9)	1 (0.8)	2 (1.6)	3.28
6.	The methods of instruction kept me interested in the training (8)	41 (33.9)	72 (59.5)	7 (5.8)	1 (0.8)	-	3.26
7.	The training helped me to meet perceived future challenges and development plans of my job as an academic (6)	39 (31.7)	78 (63.4)	2 (1.6)	1 (0.8)	3 (2.4)	3.21
8.	The mix of presentation versus activities in the training was very suitable (10)	35 (28.5)	77 (62.6)	11 (8.9)	-	-	3.20

9.	The size of the training group was appropriate (7)	29 (23.8)	74 (60.7)	14 (11.5)	1 (0.8)	4 (3.3)	3.01
10.	I had enough opportunities to practice the skills being promoted during the training programme (3)	20 (16.3)	69 (56.1)	25 (20.3)	4 (3.3)	5 (4.1)	2.77
Overall Mean							3.26

Source: Field Survey, 2019

† These numbers represent the position of the items in the administered questionnaire

The results depict satisfactory responses on each of the items with an overall mean of 3.26 out of an obtainable score of 4. However, the two items which may need to be reconsidered in subsequent training sessions include: the provision of adequate opportunities to practice the skills being promoted during the training programme (item 3) with a mean value of 2.77 and the size of the training group (item 7) with a mean value of 3.01.

As there is sparse evaluative literature on programmes such as PET developed for higher institution academic staff particularly in developing countries, which no doubt is due to the relatively novel nature of such programmes, participants' invaluable responses on the adequacy of the objectives designed for the programme will fill a wide gap in literature and guide those who may want to float similar programmes. This study corroborates findings in some of the few available studies accessed on adequacy of the programme and learning experiences offered. [32] and [3] in their evaluation of pedagogical skills training programmes in Makerere University, Uganda, and Adama Science and Technology University, Ethiopia, respectively, found that participants responded positively to the training and learning experiences provided. The positive responses of participants to pedagogical skills training as found in these studies including the present study also give credence to the findings of [9] who found that university teachers had a positive disposition to pedagogical skills training and were actually willing to participate in training whenever it came up.

In order to gather enough data that could help make inference on the adequacy of the training in promoting the teaching skills of the participants, micro-teaching sessions were conducted. A summary of the observations made by the supervisors on some of the microteaching sessions is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Supervisors’ feedback from microteaching sessions

Participant Label	Supervisors’ Comments/Feedback	Emergent areas for pedagogy improvement
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The teacher did not use the students’ background knowledge b. Students were not engaged. The teacher used lecture method c. No instructional resources used 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Background knowledge probe 2. Student engagement
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The content was linked to students’ background by the teachers though the students could have been prompted for responses b. Teaching was linked to everyday use thereby making the class take-off interesting c. The need for students to be continuously engaged is important. Teacher to use less of lecture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More student engagement
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The teacher did not allow students to brainstorm on concept(s) based on their background b. The teacher did not use the board c. The teacher related the concept to contemporary ideas d. The teacher only encouraged students’ participation towards the end of the class (summative evaluation) e. The evaluation questions were apt and contemporary f. The teacher seemed lost when steps in lesson plan were missed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student engagement 2. The art of using the chalkboard during teaching 3. Contingency teaching/Incidental lessons
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Revision of the last class was done solely by the teacher b. Students were not encouraged to brainstorm c. The presentation on the board was not well organised d. Higher Order Thinking evoking questions of ‘why’ and ‘how’ were missing from the interaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instructional resource use 2. Higher Order Questioning skill
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The introduction was well related to the background b. The required waiting time between questioning and students’ responses was not observed c. Evaluation was not on-going; it was left till the end of the class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs) 2. Use of questioning as an assessment tool and teaching technique
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The teacher started the lesson with a good ‘poser’ (set induction) that captured students’ attention and evoked evidence of critical thinking b. The voice level of teacher was low (soft spoken) c. The teacher started the lesson by stating objectives that are measurable d. The teacher made adequate use of formative evaluation e. The class was interesting and participatory. The teacher asked questions that encouraged critical thinking f. Attempts to draw diagrams that would concretise the lesson taught left the students unengaged for a while. The drawing should have been drawn from home. g. The teacher gave take-home exercises that would engage the students after the class. h. Appropriate lesson closure was given which provided the students with what to expect in the next class 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Presentation of instructional resource/material
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Lecture method was used. Hence, the teaching and learning process was too passive b. The teacher gave examples and came up with answers; he did not probe in order to elicit responses from the students c. The teacher did not allow sufficient time for the students to think and answer the questions. d. The teacher was talking to the class while writing on the board. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Student-centred teaching 2. Student engagement 3. Questioning technique 4. The art of using the board
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The teacher linked the topic with students’ previous knowledge. He got the students interested in the content/topic via a demystification of what to expect in it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Satisfactory

	b. He carried the students along relatively well	
	c. He had the right approach to the use of the board – well organized; he did not face the board while addressing the students	
	d. Various forms of illustrations were used	
	e. The teacher linked concepts taught during the lesson to one another	
I	a. The teacher linked the topic to the learners' previous knowledge	1. The use of questioning as instructional strategy
	b. He simplified the concepts in order to aid students' learning	
	c. He did not probe in order to obtain concrete responses from students	
J	a. The teacher captured the students' attention through the way she introduced the lesson	1. Set induction
	b. The topic was not known throughout the allotted instructional time	2. Pacing of instruction
	c. Time was not well managed	3. Time management

Source: Field Survey, 2019

From Table 3, areas of need to be addressed in subsequent training sessions should include: Use of Background Knowledge Probe (BKP); engaging students throughout the teaching and learning period; use of the board and other forms of instructional resources including Information, Communication and Technology (ICT) tools; incidental teaching and learning and avoiding voids during teaching; use of questioning as a teaching technique and as a formative evaluation tool; instruction pacing and time management in university teaching.

7. Conclusion

This study has unearthed some issues to be considered in the subsequent implementation of the PET programme in Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria, if the set goals of the programme are to be achieved. Funding remains a challenge, bringing to fore the need to explore alternative financing options in addition to the funding provided by the University's Management. Beyond funding, the study highlighted the need for expanding the objectives of the training in order to meet the growing needs of teachers and students in the institution and in keeping up with the vision of the University. Deficiencies of participants after having been exposed to the training as highlighted in this study underscores the importance of continuous and regular exposure of university lecturers to pedagogical skills training. It is very essential for the organisers and the University Management to consider this feedback from the recipients of the programme in order to make the programme more relevant to the needs of the recipients, that is, the academic staff with a direct consequence on their students and the University.

The findings of this study underscore the need for the establishment of a Centre for the Promotion of Pedagogical Skills for Higher Education that will cater for the identified expected and expanding pedagogical needs of academic staff in higher institutions and ensure the institutionalisation and sustainability of the PET programme.

References

- i Cahn, S. M. (1978). *Scholars who teach: The art of college teaching*. Chicago, IL: Nelson Hall
- ii Biku, T., Demas, T., Woldehawariat, N., Getahun, M., & Mekonnen, A. (2018). *The effect of teaching without pedagogical training in St. Paul's Hospital Millennium Medical College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia*. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 9, 893-904.
- iii Negassa, T. & Engdasew, Z. (2017). *The impacts and challenges of pedagogical skills improvement program at Adama Science and Technology University*. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10 (4). 19-38. <https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.1042a>
- iv Tsegay, S. M., Zegergish, M. Z. & Ashraf, M.A. (2018). *Pedagogical practices and students' experiences in Eritrean higher institutions*. *Higher Education for the Future* 5(1), 89-103. <https://doi.org.10.1177/2347631117738653>
- v Berrett, D. (2012). *How 'flipping' the classroom can improve the traditional lecture*. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/How-Flipping-the-Classroom/130857/>.
- vi Ramsden, P. (2003). *Learning to teach in higher education (2nd ed.)*. London & New York: Routledge Falmer.
- vii Ehindero, O.J. & Ajibade, Y.A. (2001). *What our students say about how we teach*. *Ife Journal of Educational Studies*, 7(1), 1-10.
- viii Senge, P.M. (1990). *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization*, NY: Doubleday Currency.

- ix *Ajibade, Y. A., Oloyede, E. O., Adeleke, M. A. & Awopetu, E. O. (2010). Lecturers' views on and attitudes to pedagogical skills training: Obafemi Awolowo University as a case study, Review of Higher Education in Africa, 2(1), 45-64.*
- x *Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). National Policy on Education. Abuja: Nigeria Educational Research Development Council.*
- xi *Aškerc, K., & Kočar, S. (2015). Teaching and the pedagogical training of University teaching staff—Practice and opinions according to the Slovenian Higher Education. Education Inquiry 6 (2). <https://doi.org/10.3402/edui.v6.25591>*
- xii *Postareff, L., Lindblom-Yla'ne, S. & Nevgi, A. (2007). The effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 23 (2007) 557–571. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.013>*
- xiii *Suacamram, M. (2019). Developing creativity and entrepreneurship of undergraduate students through a field trip overseas. International Journal of Instruction, 12(1), 591-606. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12138a>*
- xiv *Harahap, F., Nasution, N. E. A., & Manurung, B. (2019). The effect of blended learning on students' learning achievement and science process skills in plant tissue culture course. International Journal of Instruction, 12(1), 521-538. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2019.12134a>*
- xv *Gibbs, G., & Coffey, M. (2004). The impact of training of university teachers on their teaching skills, their approach to teaching and the approach to learning of their students. Active Learning in Higher Education, 5(1), 87–100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787404040463>*
- xvi *Cross, P. K. (2001). Leading-edge efforts to improve teaching and learning. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 33(4), 30-37*
- xvii *D'Andrea, V. & Gosling, D. (2005). Improving teaching and learning in higher education: A whole institution approach. London: Open University Press (McGraw Hill Education).*
- xviii *Fielden, J. (1998). Higher education staff development: a continuing mission. <http://www.unesco.org/education/educprog/wche/principal/mission.html>*
- xix *Graca, S. (2008). Professional development of the university teacher: A contribution for its analysis. Educational Sciences Journal, 7, 121132.*
- xx *Lueddeke, G. R. (2003). Professionalising teaching practice in higher education: a study of disciplinary variation and 'teaching-scholarship'. Studies in Higher Education, 28(2), 213-228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0307507032000058082>*
- xxi *Marentič Požarnik, B., & Šteh, B. (2006). Students' perceptions of teaching/learning situation as a trigger for reflection in staff development courses. In The European conference on educational research. Rethymnon: Faculty of Education, University of Crete, 22nd-25th September 2004.*
- xxii *Marentič Požarnik, B. (2009). Improving the quality of teaching and learning in higher education through supporting professional development of teaching staff. Napredak, 150(3/4), 341-359.*
- xxiii *Rosado Pinto, P. (2008). Teacher training in higher education: the case of teachers of medicine. Educational Sciences Journal, 7, 107-120.*
- xxiv *Hanbury, A., Prosser, M. et Rickinson, M. (2008). The differential impact of UK accredited teaching development programs on academics' approaches to teaching. Studies in Higher Education, 33(4), 449-483*

- xxv Lindberg-Sand, Å, & Sonesson, A. (2008). *Compulsory higher education teacher training in Sweden: Development of a national standards framework based on the scholarship of teaching and learning. Tertiary Education and Management*, 14(2), 123–139.
- xxvi Stigmar, M. (2008). *Faculty development through an educational action programme. Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(2), 107–120.
- xxvii Trowler, P., & Bamber, R. (2005). *Compulsory higher education teacher training: Joined-up policies, institutional architectures and enhancement cultures. International Journal for Academic Development*, 10(2), 79–93.
- xxviii Weurlander, M., & Stenfors-Hayes, T. (2008). *Developing medical teachers' thinking and practice: Impact of a staff development course. Higher Education Research & Development*, 27(2), 143–153.
- xxix Stes, A., De Maeyer, S., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2012). *Instructional development for teachers in higher education: Effects on student learning outcomes. Teaching in Higher Education*, 17(3), 295–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.611872>
- xxx Trigwell, K., Caballero Rodriguez, K., & Han, F. (2012). *Assessing the impact of a university teaching development programme. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(4), 499–511
- xxxi Fredua-Kwarteng, E & Kwaku Ofori, S. (2018, October 5). *Accreditation lies at the heart of development, University World News. Retrieved from <https://www.universityworldnews.com>*
- xxxii Ezati, B. A., Opolot-Okurut, C. & Ssentamu, P. N. (2014). *Addressing pedagogical training needs of teaching staff: Lessons from Makerere University Short Professional Development Programs 2006 – 2010. American Journal of Educational Research*, 2(12), 1190-1198.

Authors' Profiles

AJIBADE Yetunde Adedoyin is a Professor of Language Education and Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Processes in the Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. She was the pioneer head of that Department when it was inaugurated in 2014 and was also the first female Provost of the Postgraduate College having being elected to that position during the 2017/2018 academic session. She has published widely in both national and international journals.

ADELEKE Moruf Adeleke is a Professor of Curriculum Studies and Mathematics in the Department of Science and Technology Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. His areas of interest include science and technology education, mathematics education, curriculum studies, teaching effectiveness and teacher education. He was the Dean of the Faculty of Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria during the 2017/2018 and 2018/2019 academic session. Professor Adeleke has published in both national and international journals and continues to mentor students at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels.

OYETORO Oyebo Stephen is a lecturer in the Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria. He possesses B.Sc. Ed. (Accounting) and M.A. Ed. (Curriculum Studies) degrees from Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ogun State and Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria respectively. He is presently studying for a doctorate in Curriculum Studies at Obafemi Awolowo University. His research interests include textbook and programme evaluation, teaching effectiveness, teacher education, critical pedagogy and entrepreneurship education. He has contributed 12 publications to good outlets including *Boston University Journal of Education* (BUJOE), *European Journal of Sustainable Development Research* (EJOSDR), *IAFOR Journal of Education* and *African Journal of Teacher Education* (AJOTE). He could be contacted through: oyebo_oyetoro@hotmail.com.