From Perception to Practice: A Qualitative Exploration into Institutional Teaching Culture

Lindsay Shaw, Kristin Brown, Donna Ellis, Peter Wolf,
Debra Dawson, Lori Goff, Erika Kustra

Teaching culture is the product of a dynamic interplay among the embedded patterns, behaviours, values, beliefs and ideologies about teaching and learning within and across the many microcultures that make up a university. Educational researchers from across Canada developed a set of Institutional Teaching Culture Perception Surveys (ITCPS) to gain insight to an institution's teaching culture at a particular point in time. Staff, faculty, and students from two institutions provided comments through an open-ended survey and focus groups, answering the question "What would indicate to you that teaching matters at your institution?" Aligning with the six ITCPS levers, the results identified both barriers and pathways to a strong institutional teaching culture, highlighting strategic priorities, assessment methods, effective pedagogy, supportive infrastructure, engagement opportunities and public recognition.

La culture d'enseignement est le fruit d'une interaction dynamique entre les habitudes, les comportements, les valeurs, les croyances et les idéologies portant sur l'enseignement et sur l'apprentissage à travers les multiples microcultures qui composent une université. Des chercheurs en éducation de partout au Canada ont mis au point un sondage – appelé ITCPS – sur la perception de la culture d'enseignement afin de mieux comprendre une telle culture dans un établissement donné à un moment précis. Des employés, des enseignants et des étudiants provenant de deux établissements ont formulé des commentaires dans un sondage à questions ouvertes et dans des groupes de discussion. Ils ont répondu à la question suivante : « Qu'est-ce qui vous ferait penser que l'on accorde une valeur à l'enseignement dans votre établissement? » En adéquation avec les six mécanismes du sondage ITCPS, les résultats ont mis en évidence les obstacles et les voies à suivre pour atteindre à une culture d'enseignement forte en établissement, en soulignant les priorités stratégiques, les méthodes d'évaluation, la pédagogie efficace, l'infrastructure de soutien, les possibilités de participation et la reconnaissance publique.

Institutions have their own complex and unique culture around teaching which consists of embedded patterns, behaviours, shared values, beliefs, ideologies (Cox et al., 2011; Kustra et al., 2014), and micro-cultures that exist within and between departments and faculties, students and staff (Mårtensson & Roxå, 2016). Institutional culture is continuously evolving in response to new generations, subject areas and pedagogical innovations. With these continual shifts, teaching

culture has been difficult to assess. Yet its assessment is important because the extent to which an institution values teaching can impact critical outcomes such as student learning (Cox et al., 2011), engagement (Grayson & Grayson, 2003) and retention (Berger & Braxton, 1998) as well as faculty motivation and behaviour (Feldman & Paulsen, 1999). Similarly, a positive organizational culture can increase job satisfaction and commitment (Lok & Crawford, 2004), ultimately leading to happier and more engaged employees, higher retention rates of these employees, and a more financially productive workforce (Harter, Schmidt & Keyes, 2003).

Eleven educational researchers from nine Canadian institutions have developed a set of three Institutional Teaching Culture Perception (ITCP) surveys, which capture a snapshot of an institution's teaching culture at a particular point in time from the perspectives of educational staff, faculty and students. Based on the framework of Hénard & Roseveare (2012), the research team determined that there are six overarching levers that are important for a strong institutional teaching culture. On the survey, these levers are made up of several items known as indicators. Indicators can help reveal the quality of an institution's teaching culture and can demonstrate the current state and the progress needed to achieve a desired outcome (Chalmers, 2008; Kustra et al., 2014; Kustra et al., 2015). Taken together, these indicators allow an institution to recognize the presence or absence of the levers, capturing the institutional teaching culture at that point in time. The levers are further described in the sections below.

Lever 1: Institutional Strategic Documents and Initiatives Prioritize Effective Teaching

What senior leaders highlight in their public initiatives and strategic documents help to shape the

institution's identity and create a shared culture of value around community, research and teaching (Ginsberg & Bernstein, 2011). Clear strategic plans around teaching and learning symbolize that teaching matters along with research, that efforts around cultural change exist, and that policy decisions and institutional funding prioritize teaching (Gibbs, Habeshaw & Yorke, 2000; Gibbs, Knapper & Piccinin, 2008). With such massive implications, lever one addresses the need for institutional strategic initiatives to prioritize effective teaching. Disseminating this message top down from leadership to individual teaching departments can facilitate more conversations around teaching and educational development (Major & Palmer, 2006; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2016), creating a space to exchange best practices and increase teaching networks (Williams et al., 2013).

Lever 2: Assessment of Teaching is Constructive and Flexible

The call for more robust evaluations of teaching has a long history (e.g., Association of American Universities, 2013; Arreola, 2007; Centra, 1997; Centra & Gaubatz, 2000; Wright et al, 2014). In Canada, current trends include the recent arbitration at Ryerson University that recommended comprehensive teaching dossiers be used to measure teaching effectiveness for promotion or tenure decisions rather than only student evaluations of teaching (Kaplan, 2018). The second lever for an effective teaching culture addresses teaching feedback and recommends that teaching be assessed in multiple ways through student evaluations of teaching, teaching dossiers, peer review, and from multiple perspectives from students, colleagues, professional staff, so that the feedback is meaningful and constructive.

Lever 3: Effective Teaching is Implemented

Student learning is arguably most impacted by the teaching that occurs in a classroom. In this lever, an institution that values teaching should have instructors who not only implement effective teaching in the classroom (e.g., by adopting a variety of approaches and using feedback), but also work to develop their own teaching practices (e.g., by engaging with teaching centres and doing scholarship of teaching and learning). This lever is closely tied to Lever 2 since constructive and flexible assessments of teaching can help instructors identify both areas of strength and those needing further development. Additionally, the institutional messaging (Lever 1) also impacts how effective teaching is implemented (Riddell & Haigh, 2015). For instance, in research-intensive universities, faculty members might be encouraged to focus on their research as opposed to developing their teaching. As such, the commitment to effective teaching is ultimately placed on individual instructors instead of their departments or institution (Jawitz & Perez, 2016).

Lever 4: Infrastructure Exists to Support Teaching

Appropriate infrastructure and resources (Lever 4), can help facilitate the implementation of effective teaching (Lever 3) by allowing faculty to reflect on new evidence-based pedagogy (Association of American Universities, 2017). Classroom design and the available pedagogical tools have a direct impact on students' learning experience and, if designed carefully, can promote active learning and student-faculty collaborations (Jamieson, 2003; Finkelstein, Ferris, Weston & Winer, 2016). Lever 4 addresses such infrastructure and recommends that institutions have adequate learning space (e.g., movable chairs and sufficient space) and resources to support

collaborative teaching methods and technology-enabled learning, as well as resources and support for instructors to improve their teaching. Similar to previous levers, appropriate infrastructure and funding for new teaching spaces is directly influenced by senior leadership (Lever 1).

Lever 5: Broad Engagement Occurs Around Teaching

An institution that values teaching should have opportunities for broad engagement around teaching by involving students, alumni, community members and professional staff in teaching activities (Lever 5). For instance, students should have a voice in the decision-making process about curriculum, teaching assistants provide effective support for student learning, and collaborative approaches to the scholarship of teaching and learning are valued (Miller-Young et al., 2017). Another form of broad engagement is having alumni, community members and professional staff provide service-learning opportunities or educational talks. Multi-faceted learning opportunities should exist beyond the classroom and through a range of mechanisms (e.g., hallway conversations, department meetings, conferences, and peer observation).

Lever 6: Effective Teaching is Recognized and Rewarded

As identified in Lever 1, institutions that value teaching establish a culture that recognizes teaching. Administrative leaders, deans and departmental chairs play a key role in sharing this message not only in institutional documents, but also in day-to-day activities and celebrations (Gibbs, Knapper & Piccinin, 2008; Roxå & Mårtensson, 2016). This recognition of teaching should begin during the hiring process and continue throughout an

instructor's career (Association of American Universities, 2013; Dennin et al., 2017). With that, this lever addresses the importance of recognizing and rewarding effective teaching through tenure, promotion or performance evaluations, institutional rewards and funding, and public celebrations of teaching accomplishments (e.g., award ceremonies, institutional news). With a push to reconceptualise faculty roles, many institutions have created Teaching Focused Faculty (TFF) who primarily focus on teaching, generally with fewer research and service expectations. Rawn and Fox (2018) found that the most important predictor of TFF valuing their roles was feeling integrated within the larger institutional culture. Institutions recognizing and rewarding teaching success can help demonstrate the value that faculty bring to an institution related to teaching and further strengthen a sense of community around teaching, especially in institutions that are predominantly research-focused.

The purpose of the current research was to explore staff, faculty and students' perceptions of the teaching culture at their respective institutions, answering the question "What would indicate to you that teaching matters at your institution?"

Methods

As part of a larger validation study, two Ontario institutions invited participation from all instructors, students (undergraduate and graduate), and professional staff engaged in the support of teaching. A random selection of 5000 second- and third-year undergraduate students and a list of staff who supported teaching or learning (e.g., educational developers, advisors, counselors, and technological support staff) were invited to complete the online ITCP survey (See Table 1 for response rates). Each group completed a survey customized for their particular role.

Table 1. Response Rate for Institutional Teaching Culture Perception Surveys

Participant Group	Number Invited	Number Participated	Response Rates (%)
Staff	1279	194	15.2%
Faculty	2480	465	18.8%
Students	13260	1983	15%

Responses from all survey participants were analyzed for the open-ended question, "What would indicate to you that teaching matters at your institution?" The survey for educational staff was new. Consequently, educational staff could opt to participate in a focus group after the completion of the survey. The purpose of the focus groups was to get feedback on the surveys and probe further into the teaching culture indicators at their institution. The focus groups used the same protocol, but different facilitators resulted in slight differences in the probing questions. For this paper only responses about the indicators from the educational staff focus groups were included in the analysis in addition to open-ended survey comments. Both the institution and the participants' roles were de-identified prior to analysis.

The focus groups and open-ended survey comments were transcribed from a constructionist perspective (Burr, 1995) using theoretical thematic analysis. Themes were explored in an inductive manner, coding specifically for the research question employing Braun and Clarke's (2006) five phase model:

1. Becoming familiar with the data
2. Coding
3. Generating themes
4. Reviewing the themes
5. Naming and defining the themes

Several revisions were done during Phases 2 and 3 to ensure that the themes were consistent, distinct and coherent enough to reflect the story of the participants. The themes that were identified in the

qualitative analysis were then compared to the framework of the levers. Through this comparison, visual representations of the data were produced to review and, in some cases, reimagine the relationships among the themes and the levers.

Findings

Two overarching themes, along with several subthemes emerged, specifically the six barriers and the six facilitators that coexist together to create a culture around teaching. The facilitators work to improve the institutional teaching culture but are often halted by the many barriers that oppose such cultural change. In this analysis, example quotes from the participants may highlight a positively framed facilitator or a negatively framed facilitator, the latter suggesting that although it was deemed as important, it is missing from their respective institution. Overall, the subthemes align closely with the six levers of the ITCP surveys and are presented accordingly (See Figure 1).

Table 2. Barriers and Facilitators

Survey Levers	1. Institutional Strategic Initiatives and Practices Prioritize Effective Teaching	2. Assessment of Teaching is Constructive and Flexible	3. Effective Teaching is Implemented	4. Infrastructure Exists to Support Teaching	5. Broad Engagement Occurs Around Teaching	6. Effective Teaching is Recognized and Rewarded
Barriers	Misalignment of Institutional Image	Lack of Comprehensive Student Evaluations of Teaching	Instructional Commitment to Effective Teaching	Disproportionate Distributions of Resources and Support	Departmental Silos	Prioritization of Research
Facilitators	Senior Administrative Support	Accessibility and Usability of Student Evaluations of Teaching	Diversified Learning Experiences	Spaces that Inspire Learning	Opportunities for Breadth of Engagement	Public Celebrations of Teaching Success

Lever 1: Institutional Strategic Documents and Initiatives Prioritize Effective Teaching

Participants highlight both the presence and absence of Lever 1: Institutional Strategic Documents and Initiatives Prioritize Effective Teaching. A key barrier is a misrepresentation of their institutional image, which is often characterized by the values of senior administration and the type of legacy they want to leave. This public identity of the institution is not always representative of how the institution is actually resourced and operated on a day-to-day basis. For instance, in one of the focus groups, a participant describes the "glossy brochures" used for international recruitment initiatives. Although the

initiatives might be successful in recruiting new students, the resources do not necessarily reflect the reality of how those students are supported once they get on campus. Other participants share similar points regarding administrative visions and speeches. Despite this barrier, participants do suggest that senior administrative support is an important facilitator for a strong institutional teaching culture. Instructors, especially early career educators, tend to follow the expectations outlined by their department

These comments suggest that although teaching might be voiced as a priority by administration, these messages are meaningless if they are not followed through in day-to-day operations (See Table 3).

chairs or deans. Having leaders who express and support teaching initiatives—in messaging, budgets and strategic plans—set a precedent for teaching expectations and how teaching contributes value to the culture of the institution.

Table 3. Sample Quotes for Lever 1

Barrier: Misalignment of Image	Facilitator: Administrative Support
"[institution name] is a research institution and is run accordingly despite the fact that a large percentage of the operating budget comes from undergraduate tuition. Despite what the university executives say in their speeches and promotional materials, I have never seen any indication that the university values quality teaching."- Participant 1, Survey	"It's not really addressed in the strategic plan now that I think back to when I read it. You just made the assumption that it's something the University cares about, but it's not detailed in the strategic plan or as a central focus, which hopefully that could be a measure going forward."- Participant 3, Focus Group
"For every new senior administration, the focus is on their legacy and what they're leaving, and they have a vision and it may or may not coincide with what is actually happening on the ground."- Participant 2, Focus Group	"Clear and inspirational statements from the University leadership that teaching matters and that the following actions taken by instructors are not only valued, but also expected."- Participant 4, Survey

Lever 2: Assessment of Teaching is Constructive and Flexible

Similar to the call for more robust teaching evaluations noted in previous research (e.g., Arreola, 2007; Centra, 1997; Centra 2000; Wright, et al, 2014), the participants in this study identify the lack of comprehensive teaching evaluations at their institution. A more comprehensive approach would include multiple data sources, including self-evaluations, and peer and students' feedback, presented in a teaching dossier. The current evaluations and the mechanisms being used to gather the evaluations are described as difficult to obtain, vague and unsupportive (See Table 4). For the latter,

Participant 6 refers to examples of instructors early in their careers fearing low evaluation scores, recognizing the impact that might have on achieving tenure. That fear can ultimately limit the number of pedagogical risks those instructors would normally implement in the classroom, taking away a valuable learning experience from students. Additionally, most of the questions on standardized evaluations are vague and provide little direction on how an instructor can improve their teaching (Participant 5).

In addition to the comprehensiveness of the evaluation system, the use and the accessibility of the evaluation feedback are noted as important facilitators. As a frontline worker, Participant 8 does not know if students have access to the evaluation

results, suggesting that discussions around teaching evaluations are not widely understood or discussed across the institution. Similarly, since most standardized student evaluations of teaching are summative (Participant 7) students do not get to see whether their instructors actually implement their feedback, suggesting the need for more formative feedback opportunities. These teaching evaluations are particularly important for graduate students who often have little to no training in effective teaching practices (Participant 9).

Table 4. Sample Quotes for Lever 2

Barrier: Lack of Comprehensive Teaching Evaluations	Facilitator: Usability and Accessibility of Student Evaluations of Teaching
"I don't know [in my department] nobody sits in your classroom to give you feedback on your communication style in the classroom…the questions on the [student evaluations of teaching] are so vague. They don't really provide a lot of direction in terms of improving that."- Participant 5, Focus Group	"*At my institution, the results of teaching evaluations are accessible to students*. I have no idea. I've been in the same classroom for 15 years, but I'm a frontline worker. How do I know if they get to see them? Nobody tells me."- Participant 8, Focus Group
"The feedback mechanisms need to be more comprehensive because professors and instructors are not going to go out on limbs unless they are supported and protected."- Participant 6, Focus Group	"I know for graduate students they don't get that end of term evaluation. How do the graduate students get evaluated so that they can put their dossiers together when they're applying for positions?"- Participant 9, Focus Group
"More invitations to give feedback outside of course evaluations." Participant 7, Survey	"Anything [instructors] may have updated or changed because it didn't work so well in the current class. I would like to see whether or not the feedback given was taken into consideration."- Participant 10, Survey

Lever 3: Effective Teaching is Implemented

Discussions around effective teaching often point to an instructor's individual commitment to the students and their learning experience. Participants 11, 12 and 13 all present examples of ineffective teaching practices that demonstrate a lack of accountability, effort and encouragement (See Table 4). In these examples and those from other participants, commitment to effective teaching is impacted by several barriers that align closely to the levers: having limited support from departmental chairs or administrators and pressures to focus on research (Lever 1), larger enrollment numbers (Lever 4), limited time to develop best practices (Lever 5) and little recognition (Lever 6).

Having diversified learning experiences that are collaborative and innovative is highlighted as a facilitator for effective teaching. Participants point to examples of experiential learning opportunities, lab demonstrations and pedagogical techniques that differ from the traditional lecture format. Furthermore, they identify the need for more informal opportunities for students to get to know their instructors in order to build rapport and encourage engagement with course material outside

of class. These strengthened student-teacher relationships encourage students to be more active learners by diminishing power differentials and making students more comfortable to participate in

the learning process. These recommendations are all consistent with principles long associated with effective undergraduate teaching (Chickering & Gamson, 1987).

Table 5. Sample Quotes from Lever 3

Barrier: Instructional Commitment	Facilitator: Diversified Learning Experiences
"In another department, I have heard a professor say they try and teach as poorly as possible so that the enrollment will be lower next year and there will be less to grade. That is reprehensible and yet allowed to exist. How do you make that kind of professor teach and more importantly teach well…They are so poisonous to the system."- Participant 11, Survey	"You have a very different culture. The students that I have encountered who are from the [science department] speak to the real push towards peer interaction, peer supports, and the willingness to go for help and to receive help."- Participant 14, Focus Group
"We claim that we do all the right things, but who is monitoring? I do not see Chairs or Deans monitoring teaching…I hear that some instructors do maybe 1 to 1.5 hours in a 3-hour slot and even that with pictures and photos! That is not teaching. Teaching takes effort and organization and needs clear targets per course."- Participant 12, Survey	"I think that interacting with students in less formal settings (e.g., going to a drop-in tutoring session in residence, having dinner with students, helping design activities such as campus days) gives instructors a better understanding of their students and helps students see instructors from a different perspective. This knowledge can help the teaching relationship. Instructors will know how to support and challenge their students and students feel more comfortable asking questions and being active learners."- Participant 15, Survey
"I would say encouraging students to participate in the class. I was at [name of institution] years and years ago and I remember that there was a professor who said on the very first day of class, many of you are going to fail. So, if you don't want to do the work, get out. That's not very encouraging…. Sure enough, half of the class left." – Participant 13, Focus Group	"Departments should be actively marketing courses as learning opportunities rather than focusing on the ability of students to achieve high marks in the course. Greater attention to alternative teaching methods, especially when it comes to evaluations. While teachers must focus on developing skills essential to the discipline, they must also allow for students to express their learning in various and diverse ways."- Participant 16, Survey

Lever 4: Infrastructure Exists to Support Teaching

Given the various implications of space on active learning and student-faculty collaborations (Jamieson, 2003; Finkelstein, Ferris, Weston & Winer, 2016), an important facilitator of teaching culture is having spaces that inspire learning, with pedagogically-sound timetables, appropriately sized classes and functional designs that are co-developed by instructors, students and staff.

A major barrier is the disproportionate distribution of these spaces that inspire learning. Participants identify that their institutions do not have enough supply to fulfill all of the student demand (See Table 5). In fact, Participant 17 expands on this issue even further, implying that some groups are given priority or access to teaching space over others. Having access to appropriate classrooms or having class sizes that are too big not only limits the active learning opportunities an instructor can have, but it also becomes nearly impossible for faculty to get to know their students and provide constructive feedback (Participant 22), greatly impacting the amount of effective teaching that can be implemented (Lever 3).

Table 6. Sample Quotes from Lever 4

Barrier: Disproportionate Distribution of Resources and Support	Facilitator: Spaces that Inspire Learning
In response to prompt 24: at my institution learning space such as classrooms, labs and studios are designed to support learning, [equipped with] moveable chairs, sufficient space, and appropriate tools. "That's my big bee in my bonnet. I know that those classrooms exist….and I'm never allowed to have them."- Participant 17, Focus Group	"Teaching spaces need to be flexible, alive with colour and clean. Seating needs to be comfortable and functional technology needs to be current with internet connectivity throughout." Participation 20, Survey
"The class sizes are growing, the expectation is really reflecting back now on the instructors and the professors and the entire teaching team and that includes TAs. I think that's why some of them now are in a space where they need to reach out to get some kind of help because they need more resources to be able to do their job."- Participant 18, Focus Group	"There needs to be more/better space for teaching: stuffy, small, windowless classrooms are soul-sucking to teach in, and while classroom updates/renovations are welcome, undertaking them without bothering to consult with instructors has resulted in rooms that look shiny, but are not functional for teaching." Participant 21, Survey
"Appropriate selection of classrooms to match class size, style and type. Often the rooms are not appropriately matched (due to limited availability) and this sometimes impedes the types of activities and discussions that can take place." Participant 19, Survey	"My teaching is compromised by the fact that my classes are just too big. I cannot offer enough feedback on written assignments or even get to know my students."- Participant 22, Survey

Lever 5: Broad Engagement Occurs Around Teaching

Many participants discuss the presence of institutional decentralization, describing the barrier of departmental silos that result in limited collaborative networks and strained communication. Some microcultures within departments that do not value teaching can impede the amount of teaching engagement that occurs not only within a department, but also more broadly throughout the institution. Participant 23 describes the difficulty in finding the right people to advocate for teaching

engagement and challenge the negative perceptions of their peers.

Participants also identify the importance of having both formal and informal opportunities for breadth of engagement around teaching. Professional development opportunities are often highlighted as mechanisms to achieve this breadth, including workshops, guest speakers, consultations with their teaching and learning centres, orientation events, mentorship opportunities and hallway discussions with colleagues and students (See Table 6).

Table 7. Sample Quotes from Lever 5

Barrier: Departmental Silos	Facilitator: Opportunities for Breadth of Engagement
"I find that the silo-ing of effective teachers is also present. There's a few people out there who are really trying and are really thinking about focusing on teaching and helping to build a positive teaching culture, but you have to go find those individuals and make them your best friends. Then you have to bring in funding so that they can then do something with that because if they have success then some of those other negative peers around them realize 'Maybe I can do that next time'."- Participant 23, Focus Group	"In my experience as a graduate instructor, there does seem to be quite a bit of instruction and opportunity for professional development as teachers early in the program. We are also encouraged to seek out these opportunities through the [teaching centre]. However, it would be nice to see more recognition of teaching as important and more opportunities for teaching to be discussed more widely across the faculty."- Participant 26, Survey
"I think there should be places that [graduate] students can get [professional development] independent of their department, but I think in some cases departments do a really good job in providing that support and I know in other departments, there's no support at all."- Participant 24, Focus Group	"Our institution does a very good job of allowing teaching assistants to teach tutorials/guest lectures to gain the teaching experience and I think this is very important for student learning and graduate student skill development."- Participant 27, Survey
"More collaboration between all levels of employees to support a successful and transparent learning environment."- Participant 25, Survey	"Seminars in which faculty/instructors (not teaching specialists) share their own experience with new teaching methods to their colleagues in a peer-to-peer training fashion."- Participant 28, Survey

Lever 6: Effective Teaching is Recognized and Rewarded

Publicly celebrating successful teachers is identified as the final facilitator with participants noting examples of financial rewards and grants, celebration ceremonies, and spotlight stories on institutional news outlets. The public recognition that teaching matters encourages the implementation of effective teaching (Lever 3) and incentivizes instructors to develop their teaching practices (Participants 32 and 34) by utilizing feedback (Lever 2) and engaging in teaching initiatives (Lever 5).

However, the notion that teaching matters is often overshadowed by the prioritization of research. According to participants, teaching-focused faculty are treated as "second class citizens" and "little coloured blocks on a spreadsheet" since research is the main metric for career advancement (Participant 29) and hiring and tenure decisions (Participant 31). Similarly, strong researchers are offered the ability to buy-out their teaching responsibilities (Participant 30), which not only sends a message that teaching does not matter as much as research, but it also disadvantages the students from learning about new and upcoming research in their field of study.

Table 8. Sample Quotes from Lever 6

Barrier: Prioritization of Research	Facilitator: Public Celebrations of Teaching Success
"Faculty and staff are much more likely to advance their careers through research than through their teaching. We should recognize and reward great teachers beyond one-time awards." – Participant 29, Survey	"I think there's little reward. So, if you want the people to be here, if you want them to learn about improved teaching and improved methods, it needs to be valued here. If there's nothing in it for them, why are they going to do it? There's no carrot. There's no incentive. There's not recognition. That's one of the problems that I think that I've seen recently."- Participant 32, Focus Group
"In my department we're constantly discussing teaching loads and it seems that sometimes our best researchers get to not teach and they get to buy out their teaching. That would be an example of a failure because we should always have the smartest, best researchers being the ones teaching our students. I think once you can break down that barrier then it becomes a lot easier." – Participant 30, Survey	"I have a different take on this. I've worked closely with faculty compensation. I feel that financially we reward teaching much more than we reward research. At the [professional school] we kind of have the opposite problem. Everybody wants to teach and we're not giving out strong research…. that's unique to the [professional] school."- Participant 33, Focus Group
"If tenure committees turned down strong researchers with dismal teaching, I would start to believe. If the administration started to actually demand tenure committees demonstrate teaching excellence/ aptitude/ interest in incoming faculty rather than value innovation/research over reasonable teaching metrics."- Participant 31, Survey	"Better financial rewards for excellent teaching at [university name] would greatly motivate efforts to improve teaching practices."- Participant 34, Survey

Limitations

The findings described in this research demonstrate the many barriers and facilitators that coexist to create an institution's culture around teaching. Although the findings align closely with past research and the predetermined levers, there are notable limitations. Only two institutions were involved in the data analysis, representing one region in Canada. Additionally, only one research assistant, who has been involved in the project for several years, was responsible for the analysis. The research team recognizes that bias and a predetermined understanding of teaching culture literature may have impacted the interpretations. In future research, the team plans on doing a more thorough analysis of the open-ended comments, with several coders and data from more institutions.

Conclusion

Overall, staff, students and faculty identify both barriers to and facilitators of a strong institutional teaching culture. These barriers and facilitators align closely with the six levers framing the ITCP surveys which helps to provide support for the utility of the surveys within Canadian universities. In addition, the analysis provided in this paper suggest that the six levers, accompanied by their barriers and facilitators, are not mutually exclusive, emphasizing the complex and multifaceted nature of higher education institutions and the cultures embedded within them.

Participants highlight that institutional culture ultimately begins at the top. Institutions may need to overcome a misalignment of their institutional identity (Barrier 1) by having senior administrative support (Facilitator 1) that prioritize effective teaching in institutional strategic initiatives and practices (Lever1). In doing so, senior administrators may need to overcome the prioritization of research (Barrier 6) by recognizing and rewarding effective teaching practices (Lever 6) through public

celebrations of teaching success (Facilitator 6). The measurement of effective teaching practices needs to be both constructive and flexible (Lever 2), forcing institutions to reconceptualise more comprehensive evaluations of teaching (Barrier 2), and create processes around the implementation of evaluation feedback by instructors and the accessibility of that feedback for staff and students (Facilitator 2). Additionally, institutions need to hold their instructors accountable to the implementation of effective teaching (Lever 3) by ensuring that they are committed to pedagogy (Barrier 3) and are providing diversified learning experiences for their students (Facilitator 3). Yet, infrastructure needs to exist to support teaching demands (Lever 4), encouraging institutions to overcome unbalanced or insufficient distribution of resources and supports (Barrier 4) and create more spaces that inspire learning (Facilitator 4). Finally, it is essential that institutions challenge the silos as the sole way of operating (Barrier 5) by providing a breadth of opportunities (Facilitator 5) for broad engagement to occur around teaching (Lever 5).

Moving Forward

The ITCP surveys provide tools for assessing an institution's teaching culture from the perspectives of staff, students and faculty. Although the surveys are not yet fully validated, they have launched a conversation around the many facilitators that coexist together within an institution and the many barriers that halt these facilitators from making substantial cultural change. Results from the open-ended survey question, and the inclusion of focus groups following the survey, provide opportunities for rich discussion and examination of trends emerging from the quantitative survey results. The research team wants to continue these conversations as they develop an online repository of identified practices of effective teaching. The ITCP surveys do not just gather perceptions; they can also encourage the exchange and implementation of practices to

help improve institutional teaching culture in order to enhance both student learning and the teaching experience.

References

Association of American Universities. (2013). *Framework for systemic change in undergraduate STEM teaching and learning.* Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/STEM%20Scholarship/AAU_Framework.pdf

Association of American Universities. (2017). *Progress toward achieving systemic change: A five-year status report on the AAU undergraduate STEM education initiative.* Retrieved from https://www.asee.org/documents/gem/Miller%201-STEM-Exec-Summary.pdf

Arreola, R. A. (2007). *Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system: A guide to designing, building, and operating large-scale faculty evaluation systems* (3rd ed.). Bolton, MA: Anker.

Berger, J.B., & Braxton, J.M. (1998). Revising Tinto's interactionalist theory of student departure through theory elaboration: Examining the role of organization attributes in the persistence process. *Research in Higher Education, 39*(2), 103-119.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101. http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism.* London: Routledge.

Centra, J. A. (1998). *Development of the Student Instructional Report II,* Educational Testing Service, Princeton, NJ.

Centra, J. A., and Gaubatz, N. B. (2000a). Is there gender bias in student evaluations of teaching? *Journal of Higher Education.* 71: 17–33. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2649280

Chalmers, D. (2008). *Indicators of university teaching and learning quality.* Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Australia.

Chickering, A.W., & Gamson, Z.F. (1987). Seven principles for good practice in undergraduate education. *American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, 39*(7), 3-7.

Cox, B.E., McIntosh, K.L., Reason, R.D., & Terenzini, P.T. (2011). A culture of teaching: Policy, perception, and practice in Higher Education. *Research in Higher Education, 52,* 808-829.

Dennin, M., Schultz, Z.D., Feig, A., Finkelstein, N., Greenhoot, A.F., Hildreth, M.,…Miller, E.R. (2017). Aligning practice to policies: Changing the culture to recognize and reward teaching at research universities. *CBE- Life Sciences Education, 16*(5), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.17-02-0032

Finkelstein, A., Ferris, J. Weston, C., & Winer, L. (2016). Research-informed principles for (re)designing teaching and learning spaces. *Journal of Learning Spaces, 5*(1), 26-40. Retrieved from http://libjournal.uncg.edu/jls/article/view/1213/909

Gibbs, G., Habeshaw, T., & Yorke, M. (2000). Institutional learning and teaching strategies in English higher education. *Higher Education, 40,* 351-372. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004148310182

Gibbs, G., Knapper, C., & Piccinin, S. (2008). Disciplinary and contextually appropriate approaches to leadership of teaching in research-intensive academic departments in higher education. *Higher Education Quarterly, 62*(4), 416-436. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2008.00402.x

Ginsberg, S.M., & Bernstein, J.L. (2011). Growing the scholarship of teaching and learning through institutional culture change. *Journal of Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 11,* 1-12.

Grayson, J.P., & Grayson, K. (2003). *Research on retention and attrition (No. 6).* Montreal QC: The Canadian Millennium Scholarship Foundation.

Harter, J.K., Schmidt, F.L., & Keyes, C. L. (2003). Well-being in the workplace and its relationship to business outcomes: A review of the Gallup studies. In C.L.M. Keyes & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Flourishing: The positive person and the good life* (pp. 205–224).

Hénard, Fabrice, and Deborah Roseveare. "Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and Practices." *An IMHE Guide for Higher Education Institutions* (2012): 7-11.

Jamieson, P. (2003). Designing more effective on-campus teaching and learning spaces: A role for academic developers. *The International Journal for Academic Development, 8*(1), 19-133.

Jawitz, J. & Perez, T. (2016). Investing in teaching development: Navigating risk in a research intensive institution. *International Journal for Academic Development, 21*(3), 194-205. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2015.108 1852

Kustra, E., Doci, F., Gillard, K., Discke-Hondzel, C., Goff, L., Gabay, D.,…& Hughes, S. (2015). Teaching culture perception: documenting and transforming institutional teaching cultures. *Collected Essays on Learning and Teaching: Transforming Our Learning Experiences, 8,* 231-244.

Kustra, E., Doci, F., Meadows, K.N., Dawson, D., Dishke-Honzel, C., Goff, L.,…Hughes, S. (2014). *Teaching culture indicators: Enhancing quality teaching.* Report to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities Productivity and Innovation Fund Program, University of Windsor, ON.

Lok, P., & Crawford, J. (2004). The effect of organisational culture and leadership style on job satisfaction and organisational commitment: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Management Development, 23*(4), 321-338. https://doi.org/10.1108/0262171041052978 5

Kaplan, W. (2018). *In the matter of an interest arbitration.* Retrieved from https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onla/doc/20 18/2018canlii58446/2018canlii58446.html

Major, C.H., & Palmer, B. (2006). Reshaping teaching and learning: The transformation of faculty pedagogical content knowledge. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research, 51,* 619-647. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-1391-2

Mårtensson, K., & Roxå, T. (2016). Leadership at a local level- enhancing educational development. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership, 44*(2), 247. 262. https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143214549977

Miller-Young, J.E., Anderson, C., Kiceniuk, D., Mooney, J., Riddell, J., Schmidt Handbidge, A.,…Chick, N. (2017). Leading up in the scholarship of teaching and learning. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 8*(2). https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2017.2.4

Rawn, C., & Fox, J.A. (2018). Understanding the work and perceptions of teaching focused faculty in a changing academic landscape. *Research in Higher Education, 59*(5), 591 622. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-017-9479-6

Riddell, J., & Haigh, C.A. (2015). Preaching what we practice: How institutional culture supports quality teaching. *Journal of Eastern Township Studies, 44*, 15-33.

Williams, A.L., Verwoord, R., Beery, T.A., Dalton, H., McKinnon, J., Strickland, K.,…Poole, G. (2013). The power of social networks: A model for weaving the scholarship of teaching and learning into institutional culture. *Teaching and Learning Inquiry: The ISSOTL Journal, 1*(2), 49-62. https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.1.2. 49

Wright, W.A., Mighty, J., Muirhead, B., Scott, J., & Hamilton, B. (2014). *The Ontario Universities' teaching evaluation toolkit: A feasibility study.* Report to the Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities – Productivity and Innovation Fund Program. University of Windsor: Windsor, ON.

Biographies

Lindsay Shaw is the Research Coordinator for the Institutional Teaching Culture Project and an Academic Advisor at Brock University.

Kristin Brown is an Educational Research Associate, Centre for Teaching Excellence at the University of Waterloo.

Donna Ellis is the Director, Centre for Teaching Excellence at the University of Waterloo.
Peter Wolf is an Independent Higher Education Consultant and Scholar.

Debra Dawson is the Director of the Centre for Research on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education in the Faculty of Education at Western University.

Lori Goff is the Director for the Paul R. MacPherson Institute for Leadership, Innovation and Excellence in Teaching at McMaster University.

Erika Kustra is the Director, Centre for Teaching and Learning, at the University of Windsor.

Acknowledgment