



# template #5

statistics for academic promotion

#### Purpose

Promoting Teaching Statistics Templates are designed to assist universities collect data about recognition of teaching in academic promotion.

These templates can be used within an institution or, where there are sufficient similarities in the processes used, to facilitate the benchmarking of statistics across several institutions.

These templates have been derived from six years’ data collection at the University of Wollongong followed by this benchmarking project across four universities in Australia and the United Kingdom.

## By academic level and gender

This template shows promotion outcomes for academic staff ranking teaching highly compared to outcomes for applicants overall. Data is organised by academic level and gender. To save space there is no column for lecturer level because the numbers are generally low and success rates high. Analysis of data by gender is related to recognition of teaching because of a perceived or actual increased likelihood that women may dedicate more effort to teaching responsibilities and/or be more likely to be employed in teaching-intensive positions.

Multiple years of data collection could also be presented in order to provide a longitudinal perspective.

Table 1: Promotion outcomes – teaching rated highly compared to all staff, by academic level and gender

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University [insert name], Year [insert year] | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Senior Lecturer | | | | Associate Professor/Reader | | | | Professor/Chair | | | |
|  | Number of academic Staff | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level |
| M |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* [Insert here the basis for inclusion, eg teaching weighted higher than other areas of academic achievement; teaching rated outstanding; teaching ranked No 1; teaching ranked as highly as other areas of excellence etc.]

## By faculty and level

Collecting data on a faculty basis is important for an institution. This version of the template can assist with faculty data and institutional benchmarking of recognition of teaching achievement. Although collecting data on a faculty basis is helpful for an institution, faculty data for benchmarking is difficult because every university groups its discipline areas into differently named faculties. Rows could be added for each year of data collection in order to provide a longitudinal perspective. Analysis by year is important because numbers of applications each year are generally too low to represent absolute trends.

Table 2: Promotion outcomes – teaching rated highly compared to all staff, by academic level and faculty

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University [insert name], Years [insert years]\* | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Senior Lecturer | | | | Associate Professor/Reader | | | | Professor/Chair | | | |
|  | Number of academic Staff | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\*\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly\* | Percentage of teaching-related applications that were successful at this level |
| Faculty A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Faculty E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* [Insert here the basis for inclusion, eg teaching weighted higher than other areas of academic achievement; teaching rated outstanding; teaching ranked No 1; teaching ranked as highly as other areas of excellence etc.]

\*\* If faculty data is presented, aggregating or analysis across several years is recommended, as numbers of applications each year are generally too low to represent absolute trends. Aggregating across years can also avoid identifying individuals.

## Other variations

In internationalised universities, it may also be important to collect data on staff whose language background is non-English speaking to determine whether promotion outcomes for international teaching staff are equal with local English-speaking staff.

## Cross-institutional comparison of statistics

The template is specifically presented in this format because it recognises that each benchmarking partner probably has a different approach to rating/weighting areas of academic achievement. Therefore, the statistics cannot be amalgamated. Each university must state clearly the basis for counting an application in the dark grey shaded column. If methods differ greatly then comparisons across institutions should only be made with caution. As discussed below, building tables of comparative data in a benchmarking exercise may be flawed unless the different institutional processes are well understood and comparable. It should be noted that there is no column or row for faculty data collection because as mentioned in Template 2 every university groups their disciplines into differently named faculties/colleges.

Table 3: Promotion outcomes – comparison between universities

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| University #1: [insert name] Year [insert year]  explain here the basis for inclusion in the shaded column eg Teaching rated higher or as high as other areas of academic achievement; Teaching ranked #1 in case for promotion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | Senior Lecturer | | | | Associate Professor/Reader | | | | Professor/Chair | | | |
|  | | Number of academic Staff | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level |
| M | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University #2: [insert name] Year [insert year]  explain here the basis for inclusion in the shaded column eg Teaching rated higher or as high as other areas of academic achievement; Teaching ranked #1 in case for promotion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | Senior Lecturer | | | | Associate Professor/Reader | | | | Professor/Chair | | | |
|  | Number of academic Staff | | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage who applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level | Number of promotion applications | Percentage of all applications that were successful at this level | Percentage applied with teaching rated highly | Percentage of teaching-related applications successful at this level |
| M |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| F |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Making sense of statistics about promotion

Statistics offer an effective way to address questions about promotion outcomes, dispel myths and promote positive messages about the recognition of teaching achievement. For example, statistical data can compare the success rate of promotion based on teaching with that based on research or success rates of women and men.

Where there are disparities, statistics can help your institution to identify areas to be explored and addressed. However, statistics cannot explain the underlying causes. If the success level of applicants applying based on teaching is low, is this because the criteria and expectations for performance are unclear? Supervisors are putting people forward too soon? Committees are not clear on interpreting teaching evidence? There may be any one or more of a number of factors operating, and further exploration will be needed.

In addition, promotion statistics about teaching must be interpreted in conjunction with other available data. For example, in Australia, promotion statistics are provided to the government as part of annual reporting and are contribute to an annual Australia-wide human-resources benchmarking exercise which has been running since 2006 (MacAulay et al, 2011). These statistics show success rates are high for Lecturer level but they decline at each subsequent level. Institutional statistics about the success rates of teaching-related applications at each academic level must be viewed against trends in success rates in the sector overall.

The Australian statistics also show that there is equal success for females and males at Lecturer and Senior Lecturer level whilst much lower success for females than males at the higher levels. The number of female applicants declines incrementally at each level above Lecturer. Institutional statistics about success rates of female teaching-related applicants must be interpreted in the light of current success rates for females at each academic level in the sector overall.

As far as can be determined, the UK does not appear to have a national human resources benchmarking exercise that includes promotions data. However, research on reward and recognition of teaching in academic promotion undertaken for the UK Higher Education Academy by Cashmore and Ramsden in 2009 and Cashmore et al in 2013, indicates that universities in the UK operate in a context where success rate for promotion is low.

The HEA research project specifically researched data about teaching and promotion and found that most UK universities did not collect data on success rates for teaching. However, from data that was obtained from responding universities, it was calculated that there has been only a 30% success rate for teaching-related applicants (Cashmore & Ramsden, p 18).

## Rating teaching highly – what does it mean?

Any one of several different approaches to rating/ranking teaching may be used by universities.

At the University of Wollongong (UOW), applicants must rank their four areas of academic work from 1 to 4 (teaching, research, academic governance or community engagement). Academics are not allowed to rank two equally. This makes it relatively easy to collect data about those applicants making a substantial case about their teaching. The statistical outcomes in Table 1 are for applicants ranking teaching number 1. They do not include applicants who ranked teaching number 2 or research-only applicants (Research Fellows).

Table 4: UOW promotion statistics from UOW website  
<http://focusonteaching.uow.edu.au/evidenceforpromotion/index.html>



UOW has been collecting statistics on whether those applying for promotion based on excellence in teaching are successful for several years. This research calculates an 80% success rate but does not include results for professorial promotion which would reduce the rate as success rates at professorial levels are lower overall at most institutions.

The data is interesting to UOW but it was found during the international benchmarking project that comparisons with other universities were difficult to make. Other universities, both in Australia and the UK, request applicants to name which areas of academic work are excellent, outstanding, significant or similar such terms and there is little restriction on rating more than one area as Outstanding or Excellent. This makes data collection more difficult when trying to understand whether academics are promoted for their teaching, because most would include teaching as part of their academic role. So, for example, in calculating statistics for the University of Tasmania (UTAS), applicants at Level E & D are counted if they have rated their Teaching as Outstanding but, unlike UOW, they could be also rating other areas of academic achievement Outstanding so the statistics are not strictly comparable.

This is illustrated by comparing University of Wollongong and University of Tasmania data for 2010. At promotion to Senior Lecturer, of 21 UTAS applicants, five rated their statement of case for teaching as Outstanding. In addition, five others rated their teaching case as Highly Significant and no other of their areas of achievement were rated Outstanding. Therefore ten applicants could be counted as rating teaching very highly ie 45%. Of these ten applicants 80% were successful. It is worth noting that the overall success rate for this level was 86%.

At University of Wollongong in 2010, of 19 applicants for Senior Lecturer, four ranked teaching first ie 21% with 100% success rate (an outstanding year). However, in order to be more comparable with University of Tasmania data collection, applicants who ranked teaching as either first **or** second could be included in the analysis i.e. 100% of applicants and then the success rate goes down to 90%. Unfortunately, this is not the same situation as University of Tasmania rating teaching Outstanding/Highly Significant as at University of Wollongong ranking teaching second can also be a default position for strong researchers.

## Other difficulties in benchmarking promotion statistics

When UK universities are added into a benchmarking data table the comparisons become even more difficult because the levels of academic progression are named differently and represent slightly different pathways, see Table 2:

Table 5: Country differences in title of academic level

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UK\*** | | **Australia/NZ** | **USA/Canada** |
| Teaching Assistant (Grade 6) | | Associate Lecturer (Level A) | Lecturer |
| Lecturer1 (Grade 7 & 8) | | Lecturer (Level B) | Assistant Professor |
| Senior Lecturer2 (Grade 9) | Reader3 (Grade 9) | Senior Lecturer (Level C) | Associate Professor |
| Associate Professor (Level D) |
| Professor (Grade 10) | | Professor (Level E) | (Full) Professor |

\* Teaching only positions also known as Teaching Fellow or University Teacher/ Senior Teaching Fellow or Senior University Teacher

1 Senior lecturer in post 1992 institutions

2 Principal lecturer in post 1992 institutions

3 Associate Professor in some institutions
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