# template #2





self-review template

#### Purpose

This self-review template can be used by any benchmarking team and is a core part of benchmarking activities. It is also a key instrument for the high-level institutional benchmarking team to use as they review all of the evidence, discuss each benchmark in the light of the evidence, and determine an institutional rating for each benchmark.

#### Elements

The self-review template is divided into six dimensions of academic promotion: Plans & policies; Perceptions & practices; Promotion applicants; Promotion applications; Promotion committee; Outcomes & review. These dimensions were influenced by a review of the academic promotion literature and policy documents across universities in Australia and the UK.

In all, 18 benchmarks were derived as measures of good practice in recognising teaching achievement within academic promotion. There are grouped under the six dimensions. The benchmarks were developed collaboratively by four universities and were reviewed by a UK and Australian Advisory Group. institutional self-review includes making a rating against each benchmark.

To facilitate the self-review process, questions are provided under each benchmark. These questions are designed to help elicit relevant information that might be considered. They may be amended by institutions as appropriate for their context.

The ratings for a benchmark are between Level 4 and Level 1, with Level 4 being the most evident of quality outcomes and Level 1 showing the least amount of evidence in quality.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Level 4: Yes** | Effective strategies are implemented successfully across the institution |
| **Level 3: Yes, but …** | Good strategies in place, some limitations or some further work needed |
| **Level 2: No, but …** | This area hasn’t yet been effectively addressed, but some significant work is being done across the institution |
| **Level 1: No** | No effective strategies e.g. not addressed, addressed only in isolated pockets, notionally addressed but major barriers to implementation. |

The **rationale** provides key reasons for the performance rating. In the self-review process, the rationale is significant in identifying areas of good practice and areas for improvement.

**Evidence** relates to the data which supports the rating and rationale under each performance indicator. There needs to be a clear correlation between the rating and the evidence provided. A high rating cannot be supported with a lack of evidence. Examples of data have been provided for each benchmark.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Plans & policies**  1.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| Benchmark 1. University plans reflect a commitment to parity of esteem between teaching achievements and other achievements in promotion *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Are workforce planning and retention strategies focused on national priorities and drivers in teaching to the same degree as other areas of higher education performance? * Do the university strategic plan and other high-level planning documents promote the importance of achieving parity of esteem in rewarding teaching achievement? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  relevant sections from University Strategic Plan, L&T Plan/Strategy  External Reference Points – eg national framework] |
| Benchmark 2. University policies reflect a commitment to parity of esteem between teaching achievements and other achievements in promotion *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Does the academic promotion policy explicitly recognise teaching achievement as a pathway to promotion? * Where there are several defined types of academic career (eg teaching-intensive, research-only, combined), does university policy affirm a pathway to promotion to all academic levels for each career type? * Does the academic promotion policy reflect sector good practice guidelines on recognising teaching? * Does the academic promotions policy offer flexibility in how academics can present their areas of achievement in different combinations eg can applicants rate/rank/weight teaching as either their highest area of achievement or as equal with another achievement area, eg research or service? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Academic Promotions Policy and associated Procedures/ Guidelines] |

| **Perceptions & practices**  2.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benchmark 3. University leaders support promotion for teaching achievement**  *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Do those in university leadership roles (ie members of the senior executive, chair of central promotion committee) and the senior governance bodies (ie Council/Senate/ Academic Board) demonstrate their support for achievement in teaching as a pathway to promotion (eg in staff forums, leadership workshops, committee meetings)? * Is there a member of the senior executive available to assist faculty leaders with guidance on teaching pathways to promotion? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Policy review process, Minutes from Academic Promotions Committee /review committee  Academic Board minutes, forums] |
| Benchmark 4. Leaders of academic units support promotion for teaching achievement *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Do those in faculty/school/college/department leadership roles demonstrate their support for achievement in teaching as a pathway to promotion, eg by encouraging academics to collect evidence of teaching achievements, offering career planning on teaching achievements, providing peer observation partners, encouraging promotion applications based on teaching? * Do those in leadership roles have a sound understanding of how teaching can be evidenced in applications for promotion at different academic levels? * When nominating academics for career development programs, succession planning, retention allowances, or study/sabbatical leave – is there parity of esteem for teaching academics? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Faculty Committee minutes, forums] |
| Benchmark 5. Peer interactions support promotion for teaching achievement *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * In faculty/college planning forums, is teaching-related work articulated and given the same or similar emphasis as other areas of academic achievement, such as research or service? * Are teaching-related achievements celebrated and valued within each faculty? * Are all faculties embracing a culture which recognises teaching as a pathway to promotion? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Forum presentations  Staff perceptions survey] |

| **Promotion applicants**  3.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benchmark 6. Potential applicants are offered advice and assistance on evidence of teaching achievement, which is aligned to policy and career planning *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Do all academics have access to a mentor or supervisor whose role includes giving sound advice on promotion applications, including applications based on teaching-related achievements? * Do career development interviews, appraisals and performance reviews include a discussion of achievements and goals in learning and teaching and how to collect a mix of evidence for academic promotion, aligned to current responsibilities and future goals? * Are academics encouraged to attend workshops or briefings on the promotion process so that they receive accurate advice and understand the types of evidence of teaching they might collect over time? * Is peer mentoring available to promotion applicants for different areas of academic achievement? * Do applicants have access to an institutional point of contact for advice on questions that arise on draft promotion applications? * Are any institutional advice and support staff (eg within HR, academic development) trained on the full scope of teaching responsibilities and how to support applicants working on applications? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg Heads of School perceptions, academic staff career planning guide, career interview proforma, professional development workshop schedules, staff perceptions, HR and academic development staff perceptions] |
| Benchmark 7. Academic mentors and supervisors are equipped to give consistent and accurate advice to applicants on teaching evidence and teaching pathways to promotion *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Are heads of school and other academic mentors/supervisors offered induction, mentoring and peer support on how to help academics prepare for promotion based on a mix of evidence of teaching achievement? * Do heads of school and academic mentors/supervisors in all faculties/departments/schools/ institutes give consistent messages, aligned with policy and guidelines, about preparing a case for promotion based on teaching? * Do head of schools and academic mentors/supervisors have access to a senior executive who can give definitive advice on questions about draft promotion applications and evidence of teaching? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Heads of School training program,  perceptions of Heads of School  perceptions of staff] |

| **Promotion applications**  4.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benchmark 8. Equal status for teaching is clearly stated in promotion forms and guidelines *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Do forms and guidelines include a statement that the university supports parity of esteem for teaching achievements? * Are examples included in guidelines of the equal status given to teaching achievements? For example, is it stated that national teaching grants (OLT/HEA) are as equally valued as national research grants? * Do forms and guidelines include a statement that promotion pathways are equally available to teaching-only academics? * Do the ways in which teaching can be rated, evidenced, discussed etc in applications allow applicants to select from a mix of evidence to best demonstrate their full range of teaching achievements? * Are the ways in which teaching can be rated, evidenced, discussed etc on application forms equivalent to the ways/spaces/ headings allowed for other areas of achievement, eg research? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Promotions forms & guidelines] |
| Benchmark 9. Application forms and guidelines for evidencing teaching/teaching scholarship are clear and detailed *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Is teaching clearly defined, eg is it clear whether “teaching” includes teaching scholarship and teaching leadership or whether aspects of these should be discussed under “research” or “service”? * Are applicants asked to reflect on the evidence about their teaching practice and align their practice to a teaching philosophy? * Do written guidelines encourage inclusion of a range of evidence of teaching achievements (including innovations, awards, leadership, external recognition and teaching scholarship) and provide examples of how a mix of evidence can be used to support an application? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Promotion forms & guidelines, staff perceptions] |
| * Do written guidelines provide examples of how evidence of teaching achievements may vary with academic level, eg increased responsibility for curriculum and leadership at higher levels? * If the university has teaching-only academics, are their grounds for promotion clear compared to those for other applicants? |  |  |  |
| Benchmark 10. Systems are in place to collect and validate evidence of teaching for promotion applications *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Are all academics with teaching responsibilities encouraged or required to collect formal evidence to be eligible for promotion? * Are there formal systems in place to assist with the collection of evidence of teaching achievements to be used in academic promotion? * Do formal evidence systems recognise and support a diversity of teaching approaches, eg face-to-face and online, onshore and offshore? * Is there a portfolio tool which allows academics to bring together a mix of evidence – both formal and informal (eg student surveys, awards and fellowships, teacher certifications, peer observations, peer evaluations of curriculum, reflections etc)? * Is there flexibility in the teaching portfolio tool, eg can questions be added to surveys, can areas of focus for peer observations be self-selected, can an academic access their portfolio online, can they access data after they move to another university? * Do formal systems and portfolio tools respect the confidentiality of applicants and give them choice as to when and how their teaching evidence is collected and used? * Are formal systems generally perceived to provide valid and reliable measures of achievement that compare to those of other areas of achievement? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg teacher surveys, peer reviews, referee reports] |

| **Promotion committee**  5.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benchmark 11. Membership of promotion committees is appropriately balanced to represent teaching *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Is the promotion committee constituted to ensure there is a balance between all areas of academic achievement (eg teaching and research expertise, other expertise)? * Is there a member with an equity role or an equity observer to ensure the promotion process is based on equal opportunity? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Committee Terms of Reference and membership  Committee Guidelines] |
| Benchmark 12. Promotion committees are well-prepared to evaluate the teaching achievements of applicants *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Do guidelines and policies given to promotion committee members reflect the university’s commitment to recognising excellence in teaching achievement? * Do all committee members receive training or mentoring, both initially and on an ongoing basis, which provides advice on how the university evaluates teaching? * Are promotion committee members briefed on how different aspects of teaching/scholarship of teaching can be evidenced and what evidence may be appropriate at different academic levels? * Are promotion committee members briefed on equity and diversity issues which may impact on teaching academics? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Committee Guidelines  Committee website  Minutes of Committee Meetings  Committee Induction program, information, briefing notes  Perceptions of Committee members] |
| Benchmark 13. Promotion committee procedures are designed to support consistent and equitable decisions on teaching *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * If there is more than one promotion committee in the institution, do the committees operate in a consistent manner? * Is each application decided on its merits, or are there quotas? * Is there a format provided for promotions committees to discuss and evaluate applicants on each area of academic achievement? * Is the recognition of teaching achievement supported in decision-making procedures? * Is there a consideration given to equity issues, such as illness and carer responsibilities, which may impact on collection of evidence about teaching achievement? * Does the promotions committee evaluate for diversity? For example, does the committee evaluate achievement against an individual job or role description, or otherwise allow for the role variations between academics who may be working on different faculty priorities (eg, first year teaching, curriculum development, academic developers, Indigenous academics with outreach responsibilities)? * Do feedback processes support both successful and unsuccessful applicants, including those who applied based on teaching achievement, by providing them with helpful advice for future applications? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Application Forms Applicant Guidelines  Committee Guidelines  Minutes of Committee Meetings  Feedback from Committee members  Perceptions of Committee members] |
| Benchmark 14. Where there are processes for external evaluation, attention to teaching mirrors attention to other areas of achievement *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * If external members or advisers are selected to attend committee meetings, is expertise in the evaluation of teaching a consideration? * If reports are sought from external evaluators or referees, is there provision for evaluators/ referees to comment on an applicant’s teaching? * Are guidelines given to external advisors and reviewers on how the university evaluates evidence of teaching? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  |  |
| Benchmark 15. Promotion committee procedures for evaluating teaching are transparent to current and prospective staff *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Does the university web site disclose aspects of promotion processes which may affect prospective staff, eg whether teaching-only staff can access academic promotion, whether there is a requirement to complete a teaching course, whether teacher surveys are mandatory, the length of time needed to collect teaching surveys to be eligible for promotion? * Are promotion procedures affecting recognition of teaching clearly described on the university intranet, eg list of committee members, how committees are constituted to ensure a balance of members, how committee members are prepared for their role in evaluating teaching, etc? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Internet and Intranet pages] |

| **Outcomes & review**  7.jpg | **Rating**  **[Four point scale]** | **Rationale**  **[Use dot points to identify factors that support this rating]** | **Evidence**  **[Provide name and web reference, data sources]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Benchmark 16. Promotion outcomes can be demonstrated to be sound and equitable for teaching *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Are success rates for applicants who rank teaching highly similar to those applicants who rank research highly, and is this true at each academic level? * When analysing gender of applicants positioning their teaching as excellent for promotion, are success rates for women comparable to those of men at each academic level? * Are success rates for applicants that rank teaching highly comparable across faculties/departments? * Is an academic who is very strong in teaching and average in research as likely to be promoted as an applicant who is very strong in research and average in teaching? * If the university has teaching-only positions, are success rates of teaching-only applicants similar to those of other applicants? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Academic promotions data] |
| Benchmark 17. A transparent cycle of review tracks recognition of teaching in academic promotion *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Is academic promotion data systematically collected, analysed and reported, including by gender, academic level, language background, area of highest ranked/weighted academic achievement and faculty/department? * Is summary data, including information about teaching-based applications, on academic promotion made available to academic staff, eg published on the university’s intranet? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Academic promotions data collection and analysis, published intranet pages,  Review reports, process for seeking feedback, Committee Minutes,  Example(s) of recent change(s) in policy/practices implemented as a result of feedback  Reports back to staff on changes made in response to feedback] |
| * Are mechanisms in place to measure feedback and perceptions about teaching aspects of promotions applications, eg from: successful and unsuccessful applicants; heads and deans; committee members? * Does the university have a way of benchmarking academic promotion with other universities (eg external committee members, cross-university review of applications, participation in sector data collections)? * Are mechanisms in place to use data and feedback to regularly review and improve all aspects of academic promotion, including areas of achievement, criteria, evidence, forms and guidelines? * Are proposals for improved academic promotion processes presented to stakeholders (academic staff, deans/heads, committee members) and their representative bodies for review and enhancement before being finalised? |  |  |  |
| Benchmark 18. Academic staff perceive that teaching achievements are valued in promotion processes *Questions to focus discussion may include:*   * Is there data to indicate whether academics are aware or becoming more aware that the university recognises and rewards teaching achievement in promotion decisions? * Is there data to indicate whether academics perceive or increasingly perceive that there is parity of esteem in promotion processes for each academic career type, including teaching-intensive pathways? * Do results of reviews suggest that academics’ understanding of recognition of teaching in promotion is reasonably accurate and well-informed? | ❑ Yes ❑ Yes but  ❑ No but  ❑ No |  | [eg  Staff perceptions data  Review reports] |