AgroLife Scientific Journal - Volume 13, Number 2, 2024
ISSN 2285-5718; ISSN CD-ROM 2285-5726; ISSN ONLINE 2286-0126; ISSN-L 2285-5718

THEORISING THE CURRICULUM AS PRAXIS IN AGRICULTURAL MANAGEMENT: CASE OF CENTRAL UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, FREE STATE

Zenzile KHETSHA

Central University of Technology, 20 President Brand Street, +27515073130, Bloemfontein, 9300, Free State, South Africa

Corresponding author email: zkhetsha@cut.ac.za

Abstract

This research study aimed to review the approaches to teaching and assessing diverse multidisciplinary agriculture curricula at the University of Technology (UoTs). Teaching academically diverse learners from broad educational secondary schools such as pure agricultural science, commerce, and engineering secondary schools' results in bottlenecks due to the disciplinary differences. In this critical review, using the lens of the multiperspective theory, drawing from cognitive constructivism, social constructivism, and humanistic perspectives underpinning deep-learning approaches of post-school learners entering the tertiary level, were deliberated from the UoT context to establish teaching and learning diverse multidisciplinary agriculture curriculums. This study further reviews in-depth theoretical frameworks elucidating good teaching, curriculum development, and the assessment and evaluation practices drawing from developmental, apprenticeship, and nurturing perspectives for multidisciplinary courses such as Agricultural Management in UoTs to establish the type of support required by agri-teachers. From this review, it could be deduced that criticality, reflexivity, and praxis remain the centre of scholarly teaching and learning in Higher Education in South Africa. Future studies should include comprehensive research focusing on contextualising the diverse multidisciplinary agriculture curriculums in UoTs for academic development programmes to support agri-academic staff with scholarly teaching strategies and participation in the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.

Key words*: academically diverse courses, agriculture; criticality, Higher Education, praxis, UoTs.*

INTRODUCTION

The general contextualisation of Higher Education (HE) modelling on education systems significantly impacts the learning needs, teaching perspectives, curriculum development, assessment, and evaluation modelling of different disciplines (Biglan, 1979). Therefore, the basic approach towards problematic known academic literacy and articulation gaps in universities should be approached with care as various contexts affect these processes. This is illustrated in the writings of George Gordond ('D'Andrea & Gosling, 2005), where reflective practitioners on effective teaching practices are needed to ensure quality enhancement. The employability of graduates and the contributions that HE offers to national and global economies are directly associated with the political spheres. In this regard, George Gordond poses a question that the author agrees with: what will improve and enrich student learning experiences: what will enhance and enrich students' learning experiences and how would teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline know if it is effective?

From a benchmarking in different Universities of Technologies (UoTs), teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline at most are rigid scientists with limited approaches to advancement in effective deep learning pedagogies; they lack the critical knowledge and the philosophy to improve teaching. As this paper encourages, the lack of pedagogical interest calls for teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline to show the need for teachers to theorise in HE disciplines, thereby being scholarly in their approach to the curriculum to realise the greater goal of *"good"* teaching practice and address the student learning needs. What constituted *"good"* teaching for most Agricultural Management discipline teachers is the partial case of constructive alignment of the curriculum (Biggs, 2003).

On the other hand, *"structured transfer teaching"* as illustrated by Pratt (2002) is

another approach to embrace *"good"* teaching, where the students exiting the curriculum and entering the job market are brought up to apply theory in praxis critically; by practically the applying the knowledge, abilities, and attitudes in their job. However, this differs entirely from students at the first-year level in the Agricultural Management programme; therefore, this shows the need for fundamentals for agricultural students in a UoT to actively gain knowledge constructively over the progression of the academic years in this programme, Agricultural Management. Therefore, a scaffolded and constructively aligned curriculum with well-structured teaching strategies underpinned by teaching theories needs to be in place for a *"good"* first-year lecturer.

To unpack these contexts, this review study examined only relevant studies over 50 years on teaching and learning, as well as the assessment and evaluation theories and perspectives, with a main emphasis on critically analysing the contexts affecting new generation learning needs in the Agricultural Management discipline. In addition, this review also contributes to the development of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL) for the programme Agricultural Management in the UoT context, focusing on Central University of Technology, Free State (CUT).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The author conducted a critical review following a desktop literature review approach, focusing on teaching and learning theories and perspectives. The multiperspective theory explicitly describes the scholarly teaching, learning needs, curriculum development, assessment and evaluation for the programme Agricultural Management in a UoT context (Hartner, 2014).

In addition, the author was involved at the departmental level as part of the 2013 recurriculation process for the Diploma Agricultural Management programme, development of the Advanced Diploma Postgraduate Diploma Agricultural Management through the CUT's Strategic Transformation of Educational Programme and Structures between 2011 and 2013; thereby, part of the review of the programme encompasses the experience since 2010 to 2024.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Nature of Agricultural Management discipline in a UoT: A case of CUT

When looking at the articles of (Biglan, 1979; Neumann, 2015), the disciplinary differences have dramatically impacted the choice of teaching methods, practices, and approaches. The nature of disciplines varies, and this has impacted various factors in HE, i.e. social justice and decolonisation notions. According to Biglan (1979), there are four types of disciplinary areas (categories), which are "*pure, soft, applied and hard disciplines*". Agriculture is classed under hard discipline. However, CUT is a UoT(s) mainly focusing on practical courses. Therefore, Agricultural Management is classed under a hard-applied category (Biglan, 1979). This is due to the combination of science, commerce, and an intense applied practical component, which applies to most universities presenting this course.

At CUT, Agricultural Management is presented from a Diploma, articulating to an Advanced Diploma and Postgraduate Diploma. Learners can then opt for a Master, and Doctor of Agriculture as their highest academic qualification. The design of the curriculum is developed in such a way that knowledge is produced through an applied theory: the praxis through the Work Integrated Learning (WIL) programme (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023), Service Learning (SL) and applied research.

This review sketched out the generic academic profile of Agricultural Management at CUT, thereby corroborating the importance of being a reflective practitioner and a higher educationist specialising in agriculture. Furthermore, this article further shows how the technical expertise of teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline in HE tends to be shallow, showing no background of criticality, reflexivity, and praxis (Quinn & Vorster, 2016) towards teaching quality, thereby, followed by unguided teaching philosophy to understand *"good"* teaching in the HE context. To unpack this in detail, the following sections deliberate the technical layout of the theories

underpinning *"good"* teaching, student learning needs, curriculum development, purposed assessment, and evaluation models for the Agricultural Management context.

Theories underpinning teaching and learning development for Agricultural Management discipline

Theories underpinning teaching and learning development in this section briefly, the student induction and learning needs, good teaching and assessment practices are briefly discussed to relook into the Agricultural Management modules teaching further analytically and learning approach, subsequently encouraging a deep learning approach and good teaching perspectives. The internal and external contextual factors affecting teaching and learning could first be ascribed to the needs of teaching and learning in HE by both teacher and student. When looking at the internal contextual factor, includes the personal contexts affecting student learning. As indicated under the topic of student needs, these include factors such as notable weakness of learning, lack of talents, unique learning needs, chronic diseases requiring special teaching arrangement and strategy (Adair et al., 1998), and lastly prior learning knowledge (Masters, 2015). Other aspects mentioned by Masters (2015) that could impact student learning are age group, gender, personal background, and social problems.

The changes in the global and South African educational systems have played a major role as external factors for teaching and learning. Changes in political and educational models and the growth of the global education system have an impact on South African HE policies. South Africa is a developing country, so it needs to be aligned with global changes. The global and regional educational changes align with the report of (Fry et al., 2009).

Theories for teaching and learning for Agricultural Management discipline. A few known teaching and learning theories guide and impact active learning. Based on the international HE education context, there have been difficulties regarding the effective induction process for entry-students in universities; generic programmes that are in place to address articulation-gap as part of the induction programme; lack of preparedness by teachers in universities to deal with aspects such as the deficit ideologies and academic literacies. Furthermore, contextualised curriculums that deal with socio-cultural factors affect HE's disciplinary differences. Understanding the disciplinary students' learning needs and teaching perspectives applies to active learning. Lastly, understanding academic development viz. constructive alignment and assessment tasks is also applicable. This section describes relevant theories and perspectives that underpin teaching and learning practices for the Agricultural Management discipline.

Induction of students in universities: Dealing with academic literacies and articulation-gap. Generally, the induction of students in universities differs according to the type of university, country, and socio-cultural aspects of the country. It includes aspects of language orientation and academic preparedness. This process is covered through pre-course assessments of the English language, introduction to the use of technical university learning resources, and, in some universities, life-skills courses, which are included as part of the academic modules. Additionally, part of this generic induction process includes transition, admission, and first-year experience, social support, which is clustered in programmes under the banners of psychological support and mentoring, and professional development dealing with induction programmes, courses, and workshops.

Extended inductions are further undertaken to introduce students to different disciplinary differences. For instance, in the Department of Agriculture (DoA), students are generically prepared through an orientation programme on laboratories, writing techniques in agricultural discourse (not a once-off process), orientation through the university farm and discussion of agrarian attire to be worn. All these steps are generic and deal directly with the entry into the university.

Teaching and learning are complex in HE, as the learner's background and prior knowledge significantly influence the approach to learning (Northedge, 2003). Furthermore, academic literacy is described as the norms and values of

HE manifested within different disciplinary practices. Here, the element of articulation gap is also included in the challenge of academic literacy. The articulation gap is identified as the systematic fault that affects progression to and through, HE, while the articulation challenges are often linked to a gap in the curriculum content. Due to the socio-cultural factors existing in South Africa, the articulation gap can also be described as the knowledge differences between a student and a teacher and between a student and another student.

Socio-cultural theories. Vygotsky (1978) clearly explained the socio-cultural theory concept whereby he referred to the social and surrounding impact on learning and human intelligence. Based on his explanation, he further outlined it as a theoretical framework that deals with the social interaction between cognitive development and the social surroundings. Universities have programmes embedded into the curriculums that deal with further learning.

For Agricultural Management modules, the curriculum is designed to encourage disciplinary discourse learning from the onset. This is conducted by encouraging students to be part of the agricultural students' organisation which hosts Agri-Imbizos. This is aimed at allowing senior students to influence junior students. Through this, it has been shown that the technical discourse, attire, and agricultural social engagements slightly impact students who are involved with the organisation. Furthermore, SL and community engagement are embedded in the curriculum to allow the students to grasp and learn concepts. SL is a programme linked to the disciplinary curriculum to ensure integration with community service.

Lastly, it is often shown that the socio-disciplinary culture is captured and significantly impacts learning highly. It is clear from the theory that the learning needs of agricultural students are highly dependent on the socio-disciplinary culture, where the surroundings significantly impact *"active"* learning. So, *"good"* teaching for Agricultural Management modules should be embedded with technical expertise as per different programmes and flexible allowance of engagement with different industrial bodies.

Student learning needs. The differences in learning needs and the distinguishing between curriculum reflexivity aspects of the teacher come as core factors in the acuity of active learning. D'Andrea & Gosling (2005) indicated that it remains the teacher's responsibility to develop reflectively the teaching that is underpinned by critical theories of the discipline of choice, especially in ensuring that learning occurs in flux. This statement is personally challenging for the author as reflective teachers in this discourse, as the approach to teaching employed to address the learning needs of Agricultural Management of first-year students has been a problem for most teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline without a solid teaching philosophy. However, critically selecting a suitable teaching approach for Agricultural Management modules.

With the multi-theories of the nature of learning, as shown by Vygotsky (1978), many factors impact students' learning, one being the surrounding zones and individuals. Since it's the teacher's responsibility to develop a suitable learning environment, critically, the teacher needs to be better informed of the following theories: behaviourist, cognitivist, constructivism, cognitive constructivism, social constructivism, and humanistic and situated learning perspectives (Stewart, 2012). Albeit to these many, the Agricultural Management nature of learning is underpinned by behaviourist, cognitive constructivism, and social constructivism perspectives (although the humanistic approach is sometimes relevant).

These theories underpin the Agricultural Management modules' learning nature practices since they are more discourse- and practicality-inclined disciplines. At the first-year level, students are expected to exit through to the prospective post-progressive modules fully engaged with the fundamental materials. Therefore, as Vygotsky (1978), Stewart (2012) and Piaget (1952) illustrated, learning needs require actively engaged discourse through a constructive approach, drawing from cognitive constructivism.

Lastly, Northedge (2003) explained the concept of academic discourse switching and participation at various levels. In this stance,

young novice farmers are forced to choose between different production enterprises and not just one, as the agriculture discipline is interlinked in all production, especially with the current saga of climate change. As young farmers, with mentorship from experts, teachers, and farmers, they further need to engage at various levels, as all activities in agriculture are research dependent.

Teaching perspectives. *"Good" teaching* traits depend highly on the different disciplinary contexts. This is highlighted by the writings of Vygotsky (1978), where the impact of the surrounding significantly impact cognitive constructive aligned learning. In addition, Trigwell (2017) contextualised this aspect by explaining the assessment-oriented development of teaching. The author's reflection of "*good*" teaching is that of the student-centred approach to teaching, which is distinguished from the traditional teacher-centred approach. Describing *"good"* teaching, as discussed, constitutes the range of contexts that are disciplinary dependent. Hence, a range of methods are dependent on the different perspectives. In the Agricultural Management programme, *"good"* teaching is aligned with the learning needs of students and the selection of teaching strategies.

Student learning needs should be directly related to the teacher's choice of teaching method. According to (McKimm & Swanwick, 2009), it is the responsibility of the teacher to find out the student's learning needs at their first level of discipline learning. Moreover, after effectively identifying the needs, the teacher needs to develop an effective and discipline-matching teaching method and use a better perspective to meet the students' learning needs effectively. Pratt (2002) explained these various teaching perspectives, including transmission, developmental, apprenticeship, nurturing, and social reform teaching perspectives (Figure 1).

Perspective	Guiding Philosophy	Focus
Transmission	"Effective teaching requires a substantial commitment to the content or subject matter"	Acquisition of content and skills
Apprenticeship	"Effective teaching is a process of socializing students into behavioral norms and ways of working"	Approach to the discipline
Developmental	"Effective teaching must be planned and conducted from the learner's point of view"	Development of the individual
Nurturing	"Effective teaching assumes that long-term, hard, persistent effort to achieve comes from the heart, not the head"	Well being of the learner
Social Reform	"Effective teaching seeks to change society in substantive ways"	Effecting societal change

Figure 1. Teaching perspectives on good teaching (Source: Pratt, 2002)

Briefly, the course is packaged in such a way that the exit diploma in Agricultural Management outcomes of the course is attained by unpacking the content of the hard-applied theory (Biglan, 1979). This is achieved from the first-year level by teaching students to use the introductory approach. Due to time constraints and the nature of the discipline (ibid), teaching is steered through a transmission teaching approach (Pratt, 2002). Although good teaching using the transmission perspective approach should be accomplished by good planning with purposeful course themes using constructive alignment (Biggs, 2012) at this level of student learning, Furthermore, at this fundamental level, teachers should identify the threshold and bottleneck concepts to aid ease of troublesome learning concepts (Stewart, 2012). Theoretically, it is assumed that a purposeful evaluation programme (D'Andrea & Gosling, 2005) embedded into the course design will provide easy identification of these concepts (Stewart, 2012).

After that, during the second year of WIL, applied introductory fundamental concepts are integrated with practical learning at the farm (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023). Learning at this academic level is underpinned by Northedge (2003), who describes the socio-cultural perspective of learning. The farming industry, at large, through departmental academic boards, allows student farmers to participate in their respective farms. Following the WIL academic industrial exposure year (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023), students spend their last year (third year) reflecting on practical experience while in participating in SL programmes. During the third year, the approach to teaching is at a higher cognitive level, where students need to apply and analyse situations (Biggs, 2012). After three years, course students get conferred with their first qualification.

Lastly, based on Pratt (2002) on teaching perspectives, the transmission perspective at the first level (introductory courses), the developmental perspective (first-year level, second semester and the whole of third-year level) and the apprenticeship perspective (second-year, WIL) are found to be effective teaching perspectives to encourage deep learning for Agricultural Management discipline (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023). With students' needs, the nurturing perspective could be a better approach to unpacking further and encouraging learning for students with needs.

Concept of constructive alignment. The conventional style of selecting students for university has always favoured the transmission and tutorial-type teaching approach. In the current educational context, factors such as being a reflective practitioner, technology, and the global educational models have forced the teaching and learning environment in universities to change drastically to deal with the articulation gap and academic literacy and to accommodate all learners and students with different talents (Fry et al., 2009; Biggs & Tang, 2007). Before defining constructive alignment, (Biggs & Tang, 2007) mentioned in their book that apart from the Outcome-Based Education system (OBE), other aspects, such as the disciplinary challenge contexts, should be considered.

In the Agricultural Management programme, the model is used to define the pacing of the curriculum easily. A simple example of this teaching approach is the "*C-mapping*". This is the mapping of the module themes that are linked to the objectives and explicitly allows students to grasp and know what is to be assessed. Initially, traditional students were never allowed to engage in assessment tools and methods that were assessed.

Thresholds and bottleneck concepts. The threshold concept is defined as the critical and fundamental concept within the module that defines the meaning of the intended outcomes of the module. These concepts further explicitly define and encourage discourse within various disciplines. It is reported by Meyer & Land (2003) that these concepts induce learning transformation, once identified and explained. Different teaching approaches, styles, and strategy can unpack the threshold to encourage students to learn more deeply. Bottlenecks (troublesome knowledge) are specifically detailed points within the module that cause a gap in learning and understanding of the threshold concept (Middendorf & Pace, 2004). For example, the agriculture discipline has various interdisciplinary focuses that require a selective teaching approach, as well as the identification of threshold and bottleneck concepts on each theme within the syllabus.

Adopting the cognitive constructivism approach, linked with cognitive constructivism and a slightly humanistic perspective, these theories could potentially assist students to develop self-learning at a higher level of cognisance. Monitoring each learner's spiralling development of learning and addressing their needs individually in a humanistic manner will be the hallmarks of this approach.

Agricultural Management disciplinary contexts in curriculum development

The alignment of CUT curriculum development within different faculty disciplines is derived from the contextual needs within the central region of South Africa. The institution's mission and objective are to address innovation and technology HE. In the DoA at CUT, the curriculum is designed to ensure the model of an epistemically diverse curriculum in mode 1 of propositional and practical knowledge. It gradually progresses to mode 2 of the epistemic

and experimental knowledge approach (Luckett, 2010). Gradual progression and pacing of this model in agriculture curriculum is through inter-module practical teaching and learning, WIL (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023), SL and community engagement. At this level, students are expected to develop a meta-cognitive thinking approach and systematically analyse information based on the practical knowledge attained from their practical competencies. These models encourage students to be more critical and analytical in agricultural discourse and are in line with the OBE, which addresses constructive alignment in university teaching (Luckett, 2010; Biggs, 2011).

This section of the review deals with the critical analysis of the Agricultural Management curriculum, recapping the induction of students and the students' learning needs. It further discusses the stakeholders involved in developing knowledge for the Agricultural Management discipline. Lastly, it provides a recommended, constructively aligned, better-paced, fast-paced, sequenced curriculum for the prospective modules.

Induction of students in the Agricultural Management programme at CUT. Teaching and learning contexts are complex in HE, as a learner's background and prior knowledge significantly influence the learning approach, as Barnett (2000) described earlier. The complexity in HE (problem with non-traditional students without prior knowledge) is ascribed and attributed to the articulation gap (and academic literacy academic unpreparedness of non-traditional students) post-1994 when non-traditional students entered traditional universities. However, the DoA at CUT first targets learners from an agricultural school pool and complements this with the intake of students from science and commercial schools. The selection criteria at this stage are only based on the academic records presented (without any criteria to select students based on background [articulation gap]). Secondly, CUT has an established CILT programme, whose mission is to engage students and teachers with innovative practices in teaching and learning. This programme provides student induction on an institutional level (through faculties), such as orientation of first years, the appointment of student mentors and supplemental instruction (Supplemental Instruction [SI] leaders: ZPD) (Luckett, 2010).

The current curriculum developed for Agricultural Management has slightly considered the induction programme, as part of the introductory courses. The different theorised curriculums include the commonly known curriculum on paper, curriculum in action, curriculum learners experience and the hidden curriculum. Currently, the Agricultural Management modules curriculum does not fuse the mentioned curriculums to ensure development and learning through practicality. Lastly, the role players in ranks are more contextualised as part of the induction. To mention, currently, the Advisory Committee meetings and once off recurriculation of the course programme are part of the quality assurance. Still, the industry has not shown effective responsiveness.

Selection of disciplinary knowledge for the Agricultural Management programme curriculum. The selection of knowledge in Agricultural Management is composed of esoteric knowledge because the type of knowledge provided in the curriculum is vertically structured. According to Wheelahan (2007), citing Bernstein's analysis of curriculum, esoteric selection of knowledge is robust in Agricultural Management, as the course content is structured vertically, connecting theories with practicality to meet the student and industrial knowledge requirements. In addition, the Agricultural Management programme aims to contribute to the sustainable production and management of farming enterprises and practices. However, the sequencing of the course does not respond well to the expected exit outcomes, as stipulated in the university's graduate attributes and industry. With the next recurriculation, my approach would be to add an extra subject i.e. agricultural soil science and engineering, progressing to an Advanced Diploma level. Furthermore, teachers in the Agricultural Management discipline should shift the WIL year to the third year to allow students to blend with the industry (Khetsha & Makhoahle, 2023). According to Wheelahan (2007), citing Bernstein's analysis of curriculum, this sequence will better be outlined as a vertical structuring of knowledge.

Assessment of, for and as learning for Agricultural Management discipline

As illustrated in earlier sections in this review, the course design follows constructive alignment and is critically informed by the student learning needs and teaching and learning approaches. Agriculture requires critical learning of disciplinary discourses to understand critical language and production approaches for profit making. Briefly, the teaching approach impacts learners' learning ability (Biggs, 2003). Therefore, good assessment practices further encourage learning when everything is precisely planned in the course plan and design. Biggs (2003), briefly through the OBE layout, explained the alignment at each course level (NQF) outcomes through the teaching approach and learning requirements, called SOLO taxonomy.

Based on the *"good"* teaching approaches for agricultural management modules explained above, a good and effective assessment model for the programme differs from one module to another. Emphasis on diagnosing learning achievement through the intended learning outcomes to measure learning through various assessment approaches. As stated, agricultural management major modules at the first-year level are regarded as fundamental and introductory modules. Based on Northedge (2003), the Agricultural Management course sequence is constructed in a mode of development per the four-quadrant model of facilitated learning. Here, the Agricultural Management module course content serves as a core fundamental subject, i.e. from the explicit instruction of the higher order questions, the priming, and self-instruction order. Therefore, assessment models in this regard are crucial to encourage deep learning. For Agricultural Management major modules planning, the pacing and sequencing of the course are vital, particularly for alignment with the espoused effective assessment model suiting the transmission approach used for the course.

To achieve this effective assessment model for Agricultural Management major modules, (Knight, 2001) further theoretically recommended its purpose, which is in line with (Biggs, 2003). According to them, the intended learning outcomes can be measured quantitatively (summative assessment) and qualitatively (formative assessment). According to Knight (2001), all course objectives should be embedded in the "*written*" assessment model as per the institutional policing requirement. This approach to assessment is used to measure student performance, and often, the norm-referenced assessment is used in this regard (Knight, 2001).

Theories underpinning the quality enhancement practices for Agricultural Management

Evaluation is a quality parameter used to measure, improve, and enhance learning and teaching in an HE context (Van Vught & Westerheijden, 1994; Ramsden, 1992). This section of the review will discuss the design of the evaluation process theory, collections, analyses and interpretations of evaluation data, and the provision of the feedback. Principles underpinning effective evaluation are rather diverse and depend on the disciplinary context. In this discussion, principles describing effective evaluation are theoretically described in the context of the Agricultural Management modules. Consequently, effective evaluation principles are characterised by effective learning concepts, good teaching, and effective assessment models.

For the Agricultural Management discipline, principles of effective evaluation are illustrated in Figure 2. In a scholarly approach toward teaching and learning, the design of a purposeful evaluation model for any curriculum should address clear expectations of learning and teaching, especially for any agricultural discipline. These activities and planning should be constantly and strategically evaluated to differentiate performance levels and induction processes for all academics. These activities should further encourage development in learning needs and promote development in teaching effectiveness through feedback. Regarding the feedback, not only should policing be undertaken, but allowing teaching and learning programmes to develop should be prioritised.

In summary, the effective evaluation model is further described by Bamber & Anderson (2012) with the discretion framework for evaluative practices. This model explains the integration between externally driven and self-

driven processes. The integration drives the QD model for individual development, which is still aligned to the requirements as per institutional need and DHET. Bamber & Anderson (2012) further, describe the individual practice alignment to the recommended institutional practices. Moreover, the author describes the autonomy, justice, respect, and ethical concerns of students, as well as the values and principles to be considered to guide student feedback and individual practices about student feedback and teaching.

Figure 2. Effective developmental evaluation model (Sourced: Hirsh, 2010)

CONCLUSIONS

This review sketched out the brief generic academic profile and challenges at the CUT, particularly in the Agricultural Management programme.

With the review analyses, the technical expertise and experience in HE discussed showed that a scholarly structured understanding of teaching philosophy through basic concepts such as "*criticality, reflexivity and praxis*" to allow an in-depth and contextualised approach to teaching is important.

From the general analyses of the teaching, learning, assessment and evaluation theories for Agricultural Management programmes in the UoTs (or Applied University) context, it could be deduced that future recurriculations, studies and academic staff development within the Agricultural Management discipline should focus on being scholarly and SoTL-based pedagogic approaches. In contrast, academic staff developments in UoTs should be specific in agri-based pedagogies, and curriculum recurriculations developments.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author supported this work Central University of Technology, Free State, Rhodes University, particularly CILT, CherTL, and the University Capacity Development Programme Grant through the Department of Higher Education, respectively. The author also wishes to acknowledge Dr Melanie Skead for her support in completing the Postgraduate Diploma in Higher Education and writing this article.

REFERENCES

Adair, C., Bear, M., Boyd, T., Boyd, K., Forbes, J., Hatfield, J., & Young, J. (1998). Awareness of students with diverse learning needs: What the teacher needs to know. British Columbia: Canada.

Bamber, V., & Anderson, S. (2012). Evaluating learning and teaching: Institutional needs and individual practices. *International Journal for Academic Development,* 1-14.

Barnett, R. (2000). Super complexity and the curriculum. *Studies in Higher Education*, *25*(3), 254-265.

Biggs, J. (2003). Teaching for quality learning at university (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Society for Research into Higher Education and Oxford University Press.

Biggs, J. (2012). What the student does: teaching for enhanced learning. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *31*(1), 39-55.

Biggs, J., & Tang, C. (2007). Teaching for quality learning at university. 3rd edition. Society of research into higher education and open press. Education & Open University Press: New York.

Biggs, S. (2011). Toward critical narrativity: Stories of ageing in contemporary social policy. In active ageing, active learning: Issues and challenges. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 57*(3), 195-203.

D'Andrea, V., & Gosling, D. (2005). Improving teaching and learning in Higher Education: A whole institution approach. The Society for Research into Higher Education & Open University Press: New York.

Fry, H., Ketteridge, S. & Marshall, S. (2009). A Handbook for teaching and learning in Higher Education Oxon. London: Routledge.

Hartner, M. (2014). Multiperspectivity. de Gruyter: Berlin, Boston.

Hirsh, S. (2010). Teacher evaluation: An opportunity to leverage learning at all levels. *Learning System, 1*, 4-5.

Khetsha, Z. P., & Makhoahle, P. M. (2023). Factors affecting Work Integrated Learning student placement process for the Agricultural Management programme at Central University of Technology, Free State. In The 10th Focus Conference: Atlantis Press.

Knight, P. (2001). A briefing on key concepts. LTSN Generic Centre Assessment Series No.7: York.

Luckett, K. (2010). Knowledge claims and code of legitimation: Implications for curriculum recontextualisation in South African higher education. *Africanus*, *40*(1): 4-18.

Masters, G. (2015). Addressing the learning needs of all students. Australian Council for Educational Research Teacher Magazine: Indonesia.

McKimm, J., & Swanwick, T. (2009). Assessing learning needs. *British Journal of Hospital Medicine*, *70* (6), 348-351.

Meyer, J., & Land, R. (2003). Threshold concepts and troublesome knowledge: Linkages to ways of thinking and practising within the disciplines. OCSLD: Oxford.

Middendorf, J., & Pace, D. (2004). Decoding the disciplines: A model for helping students learn disciplinary ways of thinking. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *98*: 1–12.

Neumann, R. (2015). Disciplinary differences and university teaching. *Studies in Higher Education*, *26*(2). 135-146.

Northedge, A. (2003). Rethinking Teaching in the Context of Diversity. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *8*(1), 17-32.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. New York: International Universities Press.

Pratt, D. D. (2002). Good teaching: One size fits all? *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 93*, 5-15.

Quinn, L., & Vorster, J. A. (2016). Pedagogy for fostering criticality, reflectivity and praxis in a course on teaching for lecturers. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *41*(7), 1100-1113.

Ramsden, P. (1992). Learning to teach in higher education. London: Routledge.

Stewart, M. (2012). Understanding learning: theories and critiques. University teaching in focus: a learning-centred approach. London: Routledge.

Trigwell, K. (2017). Transitions within the university: Concepts and cases. London: Routledge.

Van Vught, F. A., & Westerheijden, D. (1994). Towards a general model of quality assessment in higher education. *Higher Education, 3*: 355–71.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher mental processes. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wheelahan, L. (2007). What are the implications of an uncertain future for pedagogy, curriculum and qualifications? In the pedagogy of lifelong learning. London: Routledge.