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**Purpose**

This document is designed to assist institutions to use the *Promoting Teaching: Good Practice Benchmarks* to carry out a benchmarking project on all aspects of recognition of teaching achievements in academic promotion.

As the sector adjusts to higher levels of student participation, increased demand for online delivery and a focus on greater accountability, the teaching function of both “teaching-focused” academics and “teaching and research” academics is generating increased discussion (see *Promoting Teaching: Making Evidence Count*). Many universities are now at a stage of seeking to clarify their expectations for teaching performance and to articulate how teaching excellence is rewarded at all academic levels and for all types of academic career. This guide is designed to assist in that process of review and improvement of academic promotion, aligned to institutional goals and best practice in the higher education sector.

## What is benchmarking?

‘Benchmarking’ takes many forms. For the purpose of this guide, benchmarking is defined as a quality process used to evaluate performance by comparing institutional to sector good practice. We recommend an approach to benchmarking which is based on a detailed investigation to understand the phenomena in question, the level of performance, the reasons for that performance, and means of improving performance.

## Overview

This guide offers two methodologies. An institutional benchmarking approach enables universities to use the promoting teaching benchmarks to self-review against sector good practice. This may be followed by cross-institutional benchmarking which enables a university to work with partner universities to compare standards and benefit from multiple external perspectives and mutual problem-solving:

Institutional benchmarking:

* gather data usingtemplates
* self**-**review againstbenchmarks
* identify issues and good practice

**Leading to …**

* Clearer policies, guidelines and support for teaching aspects of promotion processes
* Enhanced understanding of how teaching excellence is measured and compared
* Better quality applications
* More robust approach to the recognition of excellence in teaching in promotion decisions at all academic levels and for all types of academic career

Cross-institutional benchmarking:

* form partnerships
* cross-institutional review against benchmarks
* compare issues and good practice

The core of both methodologies is the *Promoting Teaching: Good Practice Benchmarks*. This contains   
18 benchmarks derived from a major project across four universities and two countries, funded by the Higher Education Academy (UK). This framework is structured to support a systematic and thorough approach to benchmarking covering all aspects of academic promotion.

Summary of Good Practice Benchmarks

(for full version, see *Promoting Teaching: Good Practice Benchmarks* on [www.promotingteaching.com](http://www.promotingteaching.com))

Plans & policies

1. University plans

2. Promotion policies



Promotion applications

8. Forms and guidelines

9. Evidence

10. Systems

Perceptions & practices

3. University leaders

4. Leaders of academic units

5. Peers

Promotion committee

11. Membership

12. Preparation

13. Procedures

14. External input

15. Transparency

Promotion applicants

6. Career planning and advice

7. Academic mentors and supervisors

Outcomes & review

16. Equitable outcomes

17. Review cycle

18. Positive perception

Also in this package are templates to assist with benchmarking. Mapping academic promotion, Self-review template and Guide to statistics are three essential tools for benchmarking academic promotion.

Many other tools and resources are included also, from which a selection may be made of those deemed most useful. For example, one university may choose to gather academic staff perception data from a survey of staff; another may carry out focus groups or interviews; a third may work with participatory teams.

## Phases and timeline

An institutional benchmarking project requires a six-month timeline from project approval to final report and recommendations. This does not include time needed to pass recommendations through committees or carry out actions in response to findings.

| PHASES OF AN INSTITUTIONAL BENCHMARKING PROJECT | |
| --- | --- |
| *Timeline* | *Phase* |
| Month 1 | 1. Develop project scope and obtain approval |
| Month 2 | 1. Prepare project documents 2. Communicate project to stakeholders |
| Months 3-4 | 1. Carry out institutional benchmarking activities |
| Month 5 | 1. Consolidate findings and prepare papers for institutional benchmarking workshop 2. Hold institutional self-review workshop |
| Month 6 | 1. Prepare institutional self-review report and recommendations 2. Disseminate findings |

A cross-institutional benchmarking project, carried out with selected benchmarking partners, is a valuable way to compare practice and standards, test assumptions, discuss common concerns and offer new solutions and fresh insights.

A cross-institutional project will typically take almost a full academic year, including an establishment/ negotiation stage and institutional benchmarking activities at each university.

| PHASES OF A CROSS- INSTITUTIONAL BENCHMARKING PROJECT | |
| --- | --- |
| *Timeline* | *Phase* |
| Month 1 | 1. Develop concept 2. Select benchmarking partners and agree upon scope |
| Month 2 | 1. Formalise the partnership |
| Month 3 | 1. Validate methodologies |
| Months 4-8 | 1. Carry out institutional benchmarking at each participating university (see above: Institutional Benchmarking Phases 1-7) |
| Month 9 | 1. Prepare for cross-institutional benchmarking |
| Month 10 | 1. Hold cross-institutional benchmarking workshop |
| Month 11 | 1. Disseminate findings |

Each phase of institutional and cross-institutional benchmarkingis discussed in detail in this document. Templates are also provided.

# Institutional benchmarking

## Phase 1. Develop project scope and obtain approvals

This first phase is preparatory. It involves developing a project proposal which outlines: the main focus of the project; the parameters (scope); why it is needed (rationale); how it will be conducted (methodology); and how it will be resourced in order to obtain approval to proceed to the next stage.

When scoping the project, consider the following questions:

* Will you consider every academic level in your project?
* Is the focus to be on teaching achievements in promotion, or are there other issues related to promotion that also need to be reviewed at the same time?
* What will not be included in the project?

Project approval includes meetings with senior executives, promotion committee chairs and human resources director to help align the project to other university strategic initiatives. These university leaders will have insights on how teaching is currently defined and rewarded in your university and the sector, the current stage of enterprise bargaining at your university, the history of the current promotions policy and the future direction of workforce planning.

The first phase of an institutional benchmarking project also includes the establishment of a project team which will have operational responsibility for the lifetime of the project. Universities may also elect to establish a high-level Benchmarking Reference Group to offer leadership and direction. A schedule of project team and/or reference group meetings will be important for keeping the project on track. Key members of the project team should have the project built into their workload, so that several days a week of staff time are allocated.

## Phase 2. Prepare project documents

A detailed project plan will be needed. This might cover a number of elements:

* aims
* timeline
* which benchmarks will be used (all 18 from the good practice benchmarks, or just some? Why?)
* benchmarking activities
* leadership and facilitation
* composition of a high-level institutional reference group to review evidence and rate performance
* expected outcomes/products.

Institutional communication document**s** will be essential. These might include:

* a succinct summary of the project , suitable for handouts, web pages etc
* drafts of any proposals that you are testing, eg draft evidence guidelines
* drafts related to benchmarking activities, eg survey questions, focus group questions
* draft all-staff emails for various project stages, including an email invitation to complete a survey (if survey is used).

An ethics application will be needed if project findings are to be published.

## Phase 3. Communicate project to stakeholders

This project addresses a sensitive area of both university and individual performance. A wide range of stakeholders will need to be informed about the project’s aims, scope and intended outcomes. Briefings will be needed for Promotions Committee members, Deans, Senior Executives, Human Resources, Heads, Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching), unions, teaching support units, promotion support units and academic staff. It is advisable to organise these as early as possible, so that the project does not seem to be suddenly underway without adequate discussion. Some key stakeholders, for example Committee Chairs, may ask for amendments. Flexibility will be needed to accommodate suggestions from stakeholders.

## Phase 4. Carry out institutional benchmarking activities

This phase is the heart of the institutional benchmarking, as all of the material needed to inform the project is now gathered. A suggested first step is to map current promotions practice, drawing on written policies, guidelines and handbooks: see Template #1: Mapping academic promotion at your institution. Surprisingly, many aspects of academic promotion may not be clearly articulated in written materials, so that interviews with committee chairs and support staff may also be needed to complete this step. This template includes a table to identify the evidence of teaching which can be put forward.

Staff experiences and perceptions are also important, as they clarify how promotions policy is implemented in faculties, the quality and content of advice given to applicants, how applicants understand teaching evidence and the challenges faced by Heads of School or Department and other advisers. Additionally, collecting qualitative data will bring common myths and misperceptions to light as well as garner valuable suggestions for possible improvements. Perceptions and experiences can be sought via focus groups, benchmarking teams, interviews and/or surveys: see Template #3: Benchmarking teams andTemplate #4: Surveys, focus groups and interviews**.**

The specific approach chosen will depend on the culture and organisational structure of your institution, but this step should draw on as many sources and stakeholders as possible. Garnering the insights of members of promotion committees is invaluable; just as valuable will be gaining an understanding of the beliefs and motivations of junior academics who may be heeding the (often discouraging) “corridor advice” rather than the university’s stated commitment to teaching.

Analysing statistics and promotion outcomes data will also be important, to highlight issues such as how success rates for cases based on teaching compare to those of other areas, whether women are more likely to weight/rank teaching higher than men and whether cases based on strong teaching are declining or increasing: see Template #5: Statistics.

Factual data gathered in this step may provide a valuable corrective to perceptions of academic staff such as “you can’t get to Associate Professor based on teaching”, or it may confirm them. Some valuable data may be found in reports from previous reviews, but usually data will need to be obtained from committees or human resources areas. In organising data tables, try to ensure that data is aggregated sufficiently to draw meaningful conclusions and ensure that individuals aren’t identified.

The following table summarises how different approaches in this phase may be selected and combined to cover the four critical areas of policy and practice, staff experiences, staff experiences, staff perceptions and promotion outcomes:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Institutional benchmarking data sources – five key areas | | | | |
| Policy and practice *choose from:* | Staff experiences  *choose from:* | Staff perceptions  *choose from:* | | Promotion outcomes  *choose from:* |
| Promotions policy, appn forms, guidelines, cttee handbooks | Data collected in previous reviews or feedback (must be recent) | | | Findings from previous reviews |
| Web pages, workshop handouts, tip sheets | Focus groups – groups of stakeholders who take part in a structured discussion | | | Workforce statistics – gender, level |
| Enterprise  agreements | Benchmarking teams – groups of stakeholders who evaluate using formal benchmarks | | | Committee statistics – teaching ranked high, level |
| Interviews with cttee chairs, support staff | Interviews with applicants, supervisors, committee members | | | Interviews with Deans |
| Map of academic promotion processes | Free text survey questions | | Scaled survey questions | National data collections |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | *Existing information source* |
|  | *Institutional benchmarking activity* |

## Phase 5. Consolidate findings and prepare papers for institutional benchmarking workshop

This phase involves consolidating the results of all the information gathered in the benchmarking activities into a clear report for the institutional benchmarking workshop. Key issues will need to be drawn out and discussed. In some cases, facts may need to be checked. Stakeholders may occasionally make statements about policy or procedure which are based on their understanding, but which may be incorrect. These can still be reported, but as misconceptions.

Areas of good practice are reported both to assist understanding the positive elements of current practice and to affirm the past efforts of many of those present, who may have made considerable efforts over time to hone the fairness and clarity of academic promotion processes.

Identifying the stakeholder group will be relevant when summarising perceptions data, and identifying a faculty or college may also be relevant. However, any text that would identify a specific individual should be omitted or de-identified eg ”Two Lecturers claimed that their Dean said …” rather than “claimed that the Dean of Architecture said …”.

After writing the report, the evidence column of Template #2: Self-review templateshould be completed. It is assumed that Template #1: Mapping academic promotion at your institution and Template #5: Statisticsare already complete.

## Phase 6. Hold institutional self-review workshop

The institutional self-review workshop should include university leaders in teaching and promotion as well as those representing different stakeholder roles. Ideally it would be chaired or facilitated by a senior staff member who is familiar with the project but can offer an objective, institutional perspective (eg a DVCE or Director of Quality/Standards). Allow an entire afternoon to discuss all 18 benchmarks.

A report summarising the outcomes of the institutional benchmarking activities should be circulated ahead of the meeting, together with Template #1: Mapping academic promotion at your institution, Template #2: Self-review templateand Template #5: Statistics.

The self-review template offers a pro forma rating document to use at the benchmarking workshop. The evidence column should be pre-populated with relevant data and findings, but the remainder is left blank for completion during the workshop.

A suggested format for the institutional workshop is:

* Explain the background, scope and activities of the benchmarking project.
* Explain the elements of any evaluation documents**.**
* Take the group through each benchmark, summarising the evidence and findings from the benchmarking activities. Open discussion up to the floor for each one. For each, ensure that the workshop agrees on and records a final rating for each benchmark, and a rationale for that rating. (If needed, record any split vote ratings.)
* Thank and wrap up.

**Phase 7. Prepare institutional self-review report and recommendations**

The final report is typically a concise summary of ratings, rationales, areas of good practice and areas for improvement. It is advisable to only include points that were validated from multiple perspectives. This report would also typically include recommendations for the future, which will require a consultative approach to development. The report may be accompanied by an action plan which identifies priority improvement areas and associated responsibilities and timelines.

Usually a draft would be circulated to institutional benchmarking workshop participants, senior executives, Deans, Human Resources and other university leaders for comment before finalising.

## Phase 8. Disseminate findings

Each university will typically approach this in its own way. Some possibilities are:

* a draft-for-comment approach, where report findings and recommendations are debated in committees, special forums, and briefings, with drafts evolving and firming as feedback is received from executives, Deans, HR, unions and staff. This approach builds ownership across the university
* an information release approach, with bulletins, staff and participant emails, web pages and other strategies used to inform the university community of proposed or approved changes
* a celebratory approach, for example a launch event or teaching forum where enthusiasm is generated for the new and enhanced career opportunities anticipated by the proposed changes
* a staff development approach, for example workshops with committee members, academic leaders and applicants, to ensure they fully absorb both the intent and the detail of the new policies, or
* any combination of the above.

## Summary: Phases of institutional benchmarking

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phases | Purpose | Organisational structure | Resources |
| Phase 1: Project scope & approval | Realistic timeline  Agreement on academic levels, areas to be included  Approvals obtained | Project team  Project reference group  Project meetings |  |
| Phase 2: Project documents | Clear, detailed plan  Clear strategy for communication  Ethics approval (if applicable) | Project team  Project reference group |  |
| Phase 3: Communicate project | Stakeholders informed  Concerns addressed | Project team  Committees, faculty/college leaders  Academic staff |  |
| Phase 4: Carry out institutional benchmarking activities | Qualitative data collected  Quantitative data collected  Issues identified  Good practice identified | Project meetings with faculties/colleges and schools/departments  Individuals  Focus groups | Template #1 Mapping academic promotion at your institution  Template #2 Self review template  Template #3 Benchmarking teams  Template #4 Surveys, focus groups and interviews  Template #5 Statistics for academic promotion |
| Phase 5: Consolidate findings & prepare papers | Consolidation of findings for institutional benchmarking | Project team |  |
| Phase 6: Hold institutional self-review workshop | Areas of good practice identified and agreed  Areas for improvement identified and agreed | Project reference group with others  Project team | Template #2 Self review  Template #5 Statistics for academic promotion |
| Phase 7: Prepare institutional self-review report & recommendations | Institutional report with recommendations | Project team  Senior executive |  |
| Phase 8: Disseminate findings | Findings of project shared with university community | Project team |  |

# Cross-institutional benchmarking

## Phase 1. Develop concept

The first phase of a cross-institutional benchmarking project on recognition of teaching achievement in academic promotion involves deciding:

* The nature of the cross-institutional benchmarking project: Is it data comparison or a review of processes or both?
* The purposes of the cross-institutional benchmarking: to compare best practice, for organisational learning, and/or to develop strategic networks.
* What areas of promotion to benchmark (decide whether to compare all 18 benchmarks in the *Promoting Teaching: Good Practice Benchmarks*).
* Is it viable? Are there international, national or internal drivers which will sustain energy for this project? Are there adequate human, financial and other resources to support the project (eg project leader, project officers, research officers)?
* Are there grants or other funding opportunities that can be tapped into?
* Will a cross-institutional project deliver significant benefits relative to the costs involved?

Cross-institutional projects do require a high level of commitment by university leaders and support from Institutional Project Teams.

## Phase 2. Select benchmarking partners and agree on scope

For the cross-institutional benchmarking to be successful, you will need to consider the following questions when selecting benchmarking partners:

* Are they recognised as best practice in the area that you want to benchmark?
* Do they share similar problems, outcomes or practices so that you both learn and improve?

A significant issue to consider when selecting benchmarking partners is the compatibility and comparability between institutions:

* Are the partners similar enough to offer transferable strategies in this area?
* What size in the university; research/teaching emphasis; academic profile; similar disciplines taught; age of university; multi-campus based?
* Do the partners have compatible institutional missions, values and goals?
* Is there a comparable commitment to cross-institutional benchmarking in this area from senior and other relevant managers of the partner institutions?
* Is there an established history of sharing practice/or an established partnership?
* Are partners willing to share information and discuss successes and failures?
* If possible, is there a history of sharing practice and/or an established relationship to build upon?
* Is there a high level of trust between senior and other relevant managers of the partner institutions?

## Phase 3. Formalise the partnership

With cross-institutional benchmarking projects, it is advisable to formalise the partnership. This ensures protection of confidential data and information and formalises verbal agreements as to scope, access to data and commitment of resources. Questions to consider may include:

* Is a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) or formal agreement required?
* How can a legal unit assist in this process?
* What resources/costs are involved, and how will these be allocated between the universities?
* How will leadership and project coordination be shared between the participating universities?
* Is there a commitment to regular communication, eg Skype meetings, visits between sites, etc?

Some principles to set out in a MOU may include: mutual respect, willingness to share and learn from each; and a shared commitment to quality management. Important areas to cover include intellectual property arrangements, duration of benchmarking partnership and termination of MOU. The Vice-Chancellors or equivalent should sign the MOU.

## Phase 4. Validate methodologies

The next phase of a cross-institutional benchmarking involves deciding on validation methods, and establishing processes or groups to carry these out. Allow four to six weeks for this stage.

In a cross-institutional project, particularly if is international, wording of surveys or other instruments might not be similarly understood at each site; methods of assigning weight to teaching within promotion applications may vary; and academic levels may not align. Validation methods will be important, and may include:

* setting up both an internal and external reference groups and/or evaluators. The role of these groups would be to peer review the benchmarking instruments: eg the self-review template, survey or statistics template. Another key role they might play would be to ensure that the project is managed effectively and efficiently to meet institutional and cross-institutional purposes
* carrying out user testing of survey and other instruments, designed to establish reliability and validity, and to allow wording to be refined as needed
* making careful comparisons of the assumptions and definitions underlying promotions data, to ensure that comparisons made across the participating universities are meaningful.

## Phase 5. Carry out institutional benchmarking at each participating university

All universities involved in the cross-institutional benchmarking will need to undertake institutional benchmarking based on self-review against the benchmarks. Due to contextual differences in size, organisational structure, location, discipline, and focus of the university, each of the institutions will vary in how their benchmarking is undertaken. The key similarities are the agreed benchmarking tools such as the self-review template, survey and statistics data template. Agreement on when the institutional benchmarking will take place is paramount for the project to stay on track.

## Phase 6. Prepare for cross-institutional benchmarking

Preparation for the cross-institutional benchmarking includes agreement on scope and aims, planning for the peer-review workshop and preparation of workshop documents which are easy to use and facilitate comparisons across universities.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scope and aims | Peer review workshop | Workshop documents |
| *Questions to consider include:*  What are the objectives of the workshop?  What data and self-review information will be shared?  What outcomes are sought?  How will benchmark partners contribute to the workshop?  Are the participating universities will to share confidential information such as promotions data?  What evaluation strategies will be used? | *Questions to consider include:*  Where and when will it be held?  How long should the workshop take? Will a day be enough, or should it be longer?  Who will facilitate? Who will write up the outcomes?  Who will pay for it?  Who should participate? How many staff will be funded for travel to the workshop? Can committee chairs, faculties/colleges be represented?  What will the format be?  What ground rules will apply, eg confidentiality? | *Possible documents include:*  Clear statement of the aims and expected outcomes  Summary of institutional context statements from each university  Outcomes of institutional reviews for each university, organised by benchmark  Summary of what each university believes are their good practices and areas for improvement  Workshop template with space for notes, issues, good practice, comparisons and ratings |

## Phase 7. Hold cross-institutional benchmarking workshop

The agenda will typically include time to understand individual institutional contexts. These may include understanding the expectations for different academic levels, how teaching is defined and distinguished from research and/or service, and the rating/weighting systems used.

Discussion of each benchmark follows. The formal part of this involves a review of each university’s self-rating for each benchmark, challenging these where applicable.

The core of the discussion of the benchmarks, however, is frank appraisal of those aspects of academic promotion that are working well (good practice) and those which need improvement. Time is taken to identify shared issues as well as institutional issues; and to suggest solutions based on experiences and innovations at partner universities. Sector issues, such as career paths for teaching fellows / teaching-intensive positions, can also be profitably discussed. The presence of academic promotion leaders from several universities is a valuable opportunity to debate the bigger picture, with potential for broader follow-up discussions and forums.

Finally, actions to be taken as a result of the peer-review should be agreed, including who will be responsible for writing up the report, how evaluator feedback will contribute, dates for completion of documents and any follow-up activities.



*Intense discussion at the cross-institutional review workshop comparing academic promotions at the universities of Tasmania, Leicester, Wollongong and Newcastle*

## Phase 8. Disseminate the findings

The final phase of the cross-institutional benchmarking of promotion is disseminating the findings across the partner universities and if possible across the sector. A cross-institutional report identifies areas of good practice and areas for improvement. In the area of academic promotion, many of the discussion points and conclusions may be of interest to the sector at large. Forums such as DVC meetings, Learning and Teaching forums are possible forums for dissemination.

## Summary: Phases of cross-institutional benchmarking

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Phases | Purpose | Organisational structure | Resources |
| Phase 1: Develop concept | Aims and scope of benchmarking project are clear  Adequate support and resources are confirmed  Benefits are clear and outweigh costs | Project team  Senior executive |  |
| Phase 2: Select benchmarking partners and agree on scope | Compatibility and comparability partners are selected | Project team  University project teams  Senior executives |  |
| Phase 3: Formalise the partnership | Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) developed  Clear understanding of project by all partners | Project team  University project teams  Legal unit | Template #6 Memorandum of Understanding |
| Phase 4: Validate methodologies | Templates, tools and methodologies are validated | Internal and/or external reference groups  Evaluator(s)  Project team |  |
| Phase 5: Carry out institutional benchmarking activities at each participating university | Areas of good practice identified and agreed  Areas for improvement identified and agreed |  | Templates #1 to #5 |
| Phase 6: Prepare for cross-institutional benchmarking | Material synthesised for cross-institutional benchmarking workshop | Project team  University project teams |  |
| Phase 7: Hold cross-institutional benchmarking workshop | Cross-institutional review workshop | Project team  Evaluator |  |
| Phase 8: Disseminate findings | Cross-institutional report prepared  Findings of cross-institutional project disseminated, including conferences and journal articles | Project team |  |

# template #1





mapping academic promotion at your university

#### Purpose

The starting point for a benchmarking the recognition of teaching achievements in promotion is a clear understanding of how academic promotion currently works overall at your university. Academic promotion can seem like a “black box” to many academics, and even Deans and Heads may not have a complete picture. They are likely to ask questions about it during the benchmarking project.

Even if your institution has detailed guidelines, there may be undocumented gaps or complexities. Are there external constraints affecting promotion policy? Can a publication on teaching count as both teaching and research, or just one of these? What is the role of an external adviser in the committee room?

Any form of self-review or benchmarking can be enriched by a clear and complete understanding of processes including the context and any constraints. The following questions are posed to help form a picture of academic promotion at your institution.

## External environment

1. What external factors impact on your institution’s approach to promotion and workplace planning?

## Academic work

1. How does your institution define academic work?

## Academic work *continued*

1. How are synergies between teaching excellence and research excellence supported in workforce planning?

1. What areas of academic work are recognised in promotion (eg teaching, research, service)?

1. How do the ratings/rankings/weightings work in each area of academic achievement?

1. Is there an area of achievement which recognises or encompasses scholarship of teaching?

## Committees

1. What is the institutional structure for Promotion Committees? (eg Central Committee, Faculty Committees)

1. If there are Faculty Promotion Committees, what is their role in the decision making process? (such as Levels B-C are undertaken at faculty level)

1. Who makes up the membership of these various committees?

1. How are external advisors included in the process, eg external evaluators, referees, independent panel members?

1. What other committees play a role in promotion? (eg Appeals Committee)

## Policy/procedures

1. Which documents set out your institution’s rules for academic promotion? (eg Promotion Policy; Guidelines; enterprise agreement; forms)

1. Who has ultimate responsibility for the Promotion Policy?

1. How are committee members prepared for their role?

1. Are there procedural guidelines for the Promotion Committees?

1. What process differences are there if any, for example: between faculties; between academic career types (such as teaching-intensive, teaching and research, reseach only); between academic levels?

1. What is the promotion cycle? How often do committee members meet?

1. What role do Deans, Heads of School/Departments have in the promotion process?

1. How are decisions made in Promotion Committees? (eg consensus approach, voting, whether secret ballot etc)

1. How does the committee reach a decision in cases where there is no clear consensus or majority vote?

1. Are there quotas on promotion? Who decides these?

1. Who signs off on committee decisions?

1. Who provides feedback to applicants and in what form?

1. Are promotion outcomes published, eg names, success rates by area of achievement and academic level?

## Applications

1. Who can apply for promotion? (Eg is there a minimum length of service? Can fixed term academics apply?)

1. How do applicants get to submit an application? (Eg can they self-nominate? Or must they be approved by their department?)

1. Are there additional requirements applicants must meet, eg to attend a briefing, submit a draft to Head etc?

1. What stipulations apply to applications, eg format, allowed attachments, maximum length, no. of referees etc?

## Evidence about teaching

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. What evidence can be put forward for teaching achievement? How is this collected and validated? [If this varies, eg for faculty or level, note the variation in the Explanation column.] | | |
|  | Mandatory/ optional/ highly recommended/ not usually included? | Explanatory notes |
| Evidence provided by supervisor/Head/Dean: |  |  |
| Position description / performance expectation agreement |  |  |
| Head’s/Dean’s evaluation (eg classroom observations) |  |  |
| Course/subject evaluations |  |  |
| Evidence related to impact on students: | | |
| Statement of teaching philosophy |  |  |
| Teacher / subject / course evaluations |  |  |
| Student learning outcomes |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to staff development: | | |
| Completion of tertiary teaching preparation course |  |  |
| Completion of formal qualification in teaching |  |  |
|  | Mandatory/ optional/ highly recommended/ not usually included? | Explanatory notes |
| Attendances at teaching-related workshops |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to curriculum development: | | |
| Resource development |  |  |
| Subject/course development or curriculum review |  |  |
| Innovation |  |  |
| Textbook |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to peer evaluation or recognition: | | |
| Peer observations of teaching |  |  |
| Teaching awards or citations |  |  |
| Peer evaluations of curriculum |  |  |
| Referee reports |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to scholarship of teaching: | | |
| Statement on scholarship direction |  |  |
| Application of a scholarly approach |  |  |
| Peer-reviewed publications |  |  |
| Presenter or workshop leader |  |  |
| Grants |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to teaching/research nexus: | | |
| Undergraduate research engagement |  |  |
| No. of Honours/HDR students and/or completions |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |
| Evidence related to teaching leadership: | | |
| Tutor management role |  |  |
| Contribution to committees / reviews / policy |  |  |
| Mentor roles |  |  |
| Formal teaching leadership roles |  |  |
| Leadership survey results |  |  |
| External leader / reviewer / advisor roles |  |  |
| Are there other forms of evidence used in your institution? |  |  |

# 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] |





# template #3

benchmarking teams

#### Purpose

Benchmarking teams offer a powerful method to assist with institutional benchmarking. In this approach, groups of stakeholders carry out analysis from a particular perspective and experience base. This work is then combined across groups to inform the institutional evaluation team.

As with focus groups, benchmarking in teams encourages discussion and sharing of perceptions. However, benchmarking teams go beyond focus groups in that each team discusses the underlying strategies and structures affecting institutional performance, and allocates a team rating for each benchmark.

Teams should be composed of peers, to encourage frank discussion. The approach of using faculty groups, where everyone is present from the newest Associate Lecturer to the Dean, is less likely to be effective for benchmarking promotion, simply because of the sensitivities of the topic. Instead, one team might bring together new lecturers, and another team might be formed of academic supervisors, in each case chosen from multiple faculties or schools.

## Sample list of teams (some could be combined, eg Deans/Heads)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder group** | **No. teams** | **Names of participants and/or how to be contacted** |
| ❒ Senior Executives/leaders (teaching, research, service, community, equity etc; chair of promotions committee) | 1 |  |
| ❒ Deans | 1 |  |
| ❒ Heads of School | 1 |  |
| ❒ Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) | 1 |  |
| ❒ Promotion Committee members | 1 |  |
| ❒ Recently promoted academics – rating teaching highest or equal highest | 3 |  |
| ❒ Recently promoted academics – NOT with teaching highest or equal highest | 2 |  |
| ❒ Promotions support (academic developers, administrators, HR) | 1 |  |
| ❒ Academic mentors/supervisors | 1 |  |
| ❒ Junior academics not yet promoted | 1 |  |

## Allocating benchmarks to teams

For each benchmark, benchmarking teams discuss experiences, adduce evidence, agree on a rating and document a rationale. Teams typically consist of 6-12 people.

If a team were to discuss all 18 benchmarks, this would represent a 3-4 hour meeting by each team. As an alternative to such a long meeting, it is suggested that each team discuss a selection of just 6-10 benchmarks. This offers multiple perspectives and triangulation of evidence, rather than every team reviewing every area. An additional reason for spreading the benchmarks across teams is that there are some benchmarks for which a particular team may have very little knowledge.

In this approach, each team would have some common benchmarks to evaluate plus a selection of the remainder, totalling 6-10 benchmarks per team. The result would be every benchmark evaluated by two-four teams, with some benchmarks evaluated by every team.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benchmark** | **Benchmarking team A** | **Benchmarking team B** | **Benchmarking team C** |
| 1. University Plans | *Eg Senior Executive & Leaders* | *Eg Deans* | *Eg Associate Deans (Teaching & Learning)* |
| 1. Promotion Policies |  |  |  |
| 1. University Leaders |  |  |  |
| 1. Academic Leaders | **All teams** | | |
| 1. Peers | **All teams** | | |
| 1. Career Advice |  |  |  |
| 1. Supervisors |  |  |  |
| 1. Forms & Guidelines |  |  |  |
| 1. Evidence |  |  |  |
| 1. Systems |  |  |  |
| 1. Committee Membership |  |  |  |
| 1. Committee Preparation |  |  |  |
| 1. Committee Procedures | **All teams** | | |
| 1. External Input |  |  |  |
| 1. Transparency |  |  |  |
| 1. Equitable Outcomes |  |  |  |
| 1. Review Cycle |  |  |  |
| 1. Positive Perceptions | **All teams** | | |

## Sample agenda for benchmarking team workshops

In most cases, ratings and rationales for 6-7 benchmarks can be discussed and agreed in a single 1.5 hour meeting, or, for 8-10 benchmarks, in a 2 hour meeting. If more benchmarks are selected, time will need to be extended.

While papers can be circulated ahead of time, this is not essential. Participants will mainly draw on existing knowledge and experience, and busy people may be more inclined to participate if they don’t need to read or prepare. An exception might be where you are also testing new evidence guidelines and would like participants to come prepared with comments (extra time will be needed).

The facilitator should be sufficiently well-informed about the academic promotions process to be able to answer participant questions as they arise, and also to tactfully correct any myths or misconceptions (it is important to avoid perpetuating these within the benchmarking process).

#### Agenda

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Welcome & opening remarks** | Explain the background and scope of the self review. Carry out introductions (facilitators and participants). Answer participant questions about the process. Discuss confidentiality. |
| **Background to today’s workshop** | Explain the elements of the benchmarking process (benchmarks, focus questions, rationales and ratings). Explain that the focus questions are simply there to guide discussion, and additional aspects can be considered if needed. |
| **Agreement on benchmarks** | Explain that the team has been asked to review [6-10] benchmarks. Other benchmarks may also be considered, optionally and subject to the team’s decision that they are important, remembering that there are numerous other teams are involved as well across the institution. |
| **Benchmarking** | Take the team through each benchmark. Open discussion up to the floor for each one. While the emphasis is not on individual experiences, particular examples could be discussed to illustrate typical practice.  Ensure that the team agrees on and records a rating for each benchmark. Record any split votes or abstentions as they arise.  Ensure that a rationale is noted for each rating. |
| **Thank and wrap up** | |





# template #4

perceptions: surveys, focus groups & interviews

#### Purpose

Formal policies and procedures are only ever part of the picture. Frequently, unforeseen issues can arise in implementation, or cultural issues can work against intended outcomes. A major study in the United Kingdom found considerable gaps between policies about teaching in academic promotion and the experiences and beliefs of academic staff (Cashmore & Ramsden, 2009).

It follows that any project to benchmark the recognition of teaching achievement in academic promotion will need to use one or more methods to measure staff perceptions and discover difficulties that staff may be experiencing.

* **Surveys** provide comparative data which can be used to make general statements about a group and/or to see patterns of difference between groups. For example, they can measure how perceptions of the parity of esteem for teaching may vary across academic levels, gender etc. However, response rates will either need to be high or from a representative sample of staff. **A developed, tested survey instrument is included here as a template.**
* **Focus groups** are ideal for exploratory research. For example, they can reveal the underlying group beliefs behind survey data about the perceptions of recognition of teaching in promotion. They can also help to understand practical issues experienced by promotion applicants. Focus group questions can be drawn from the focus questions in the *Good Practice Benchmarks,* concentrating on those for which a qualitative or experiential evaluation is needed.
* **One-to-one interviews** offer a safe environment for individual discussions. Unsuccessful applicants, for example, may not be comfortable talking about their experiences in a group setting. Promotions committee chairs may want to share experiences but not in a group where people might think they recognise individuals in their statements.

## Survey

This survey was developed and tested in several universities as part of the HEA Promoting Teaching project. The aim is to provide evidence of staff perceptions about promotion based on teaching achievements.

It is useful when gathering evidence for Benchmark 5 ‘Peer interactions support parity of esteem for teaching achievement in promotion’, and Benchmark 18 ‘Academic staff perceive that teaching achievements are valued in promotion processes’. Whilst it is possible to collect this information from focus groups, benchmarking teams or individual interviews, some universities found it informative to do this using this anonymous online survey tool.

The data gathered from this type of survey can be used to gauge whether or not institutional policies and practice have had an impact and are perceived to be effective by academic staff. In particular discrepancies between the ‘how important are” and “how important should be” questions (1 & 3, and 4 & 7) can be quite informative about the culture within an institution.

## Survey: Perceptions of Teaching in Academic Promotions

### Departmental Initiatives

**1.**  To what extent ***are*** the following regarded as important for promotion by your College/School/Department?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | Fairly important | Fairly unimportant | Not important | Don't know |
| **a.** Teaching activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Research activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Leadership & administration activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Community engagement activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**2.**  Please **describe** any other activities/criteria that ***are*** regarded as important for promotion by your College/School/Department.

**3.**  To what extent do you think the following **should be** regarded as important for promotion by your College/School/Department?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | Fairly important | Fairly unimportant | Not important | Don't know |
| **a.** Teaching activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Research activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Leadership & administration activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Community engagement activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**4.**  Please **describe** any other activities/criteria that you think **should be** regarded as important for promotion by your College/School/Department.

**5.**  Please indicate how important you think the following criteria **are** for assessing and rewarding teaching in academic promotion by your College/School/Department

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | Fairly important | Fairly unimportant | | Not important | | Not used / N/A | Don't know |
| **a.** Student views | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Student outcomes | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Curriculum/Module development | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Number of hours allocated to teaching related responsibilities | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **e.** Leadership/ Management of teaching related activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **f.** Peer observation of teaching | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **g.** Peer reviewed publications | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **h.** Peer reviewed awards | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **i.** Peer reviewed grants | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **j.** Teaching portfolio | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **k.** National/International profile | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **l.** Pedagogic research | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**6.**  Please **describe** below any other criteria **that your College/School/Department uses** for assessing and rewarding teaching in academic promotion.

**7.**  Please indicate how important you think the following criteria **should be** for assessing and rewarding teaching in academic promotion in your College/School/Department.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | Fairly important | Fairly unimportant | | Not important | | Not used / N/A | Don't know |
| **a.** Student views | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Student outcomes | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Curriculum/Module development | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Number of hours allocated to teaching related responsibilities | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **e.** Leadership/ Management of teaching related activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **f.** Peer observation of teaching | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **g.** Peer reviewed publications | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **h.** Peer reviewed awards | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **i.** Peer reviewed grants | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **j.** Teaching portfolio | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **k.** National/International profile | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **l.** Pedagogic research | 🔾 | 🔾 | | 🔾 | | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**8.**  Please **describe** below any other criteria that you think your College/School/Department **should use** for assessing and rewarding teaching in academic promotion.

**Institutional Initiatives**

**9.**  Please indicate if you are aware, or have experience of, any initiatives within your institution that offer **support for teaching**

🔾 Unaware of   
🔾 Aware of (but have not actively participated in)   
🔾 Experience of (through active participation)

Please list specific example(s) of the initiatives that offer **support for teaching** that you are aware, or have experience of.

**10.**  Please indicate if you are aware, or have experience of, **professional development for teaching** initiatives within your institution.

🔾 Unaware of   
🔾 Aware of (but have not actively participated in)   
🔾 Experience of (through active participation)

Please list specific example(s) of the **professional development for teaching** initiatives that you are aware, or have experience of.

**11.**  How effective do you think each of the following are in raising the esteem of learning and teaching?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very effective | Fairly effective | Fairly ineffective | Not effective | Don't know/Unsure |
| **a.** A culture that supports and recognises teaching | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Central support for teaching initiatives | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Professional development for teaching initiatives | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Institutional promotions strategy | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **e.** Taking account of teaching in appointments | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **f.** Funding for teaching innovation | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **g.** Including pedagogic research in the research excellence framework | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **h.** Technical support for e-learning | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **i.** Workshops on discipline-specific teaching | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**12.**  Please **describe** anything else you think **is** important in raising the esteem of learning and teaching at your institution.

**13.**  Please **describe** anything else you think **should be** important in raising the esteem of learning and teaching at your institution.

**14.**  Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement:

**"This University embraces a culture which recognises teaching as a pathway to promotion"**

🔾 Strongly agree

🔾 Agree

🔾 Disagree

🔾 Strongly disagree

🔾 Not sure / Don’t know

### Any other comments

**15.**  Please note **any other comments** you would like to make.

### Some information about yourself

We are asking the following questions to help us with the analysis. Please be assured that all responses will be treated in the strictest confidence and no individuals will be identified in any subsequent publications or reports resulting from the research.

**16.**  What is your gender?

**17.**  Which Academic College/School/Department do you belong to?

**18.**  Please indicate which of the following best describes your current position at your institution:

🔾 Associate Lecturer

🔾 Lecturer

🔾 Senior Lecturer

🔾 Teaching Fellow

🔾 Senior Teaching Fellow

🔾 Reader

🔾 Associate Professor

🔾 Professor

🔾 Casual Employee (e.g. tutor, marker, casual lecturer or demonstrator)

🔾 Other (please specify):

1. Please **tell us** the year you first started working at your current institution (eg 2008)

**20.**   **(a)** Have you applied for promotion while at your current institution?

🔾 Yes 🔾 No (If *No*, please proceed to Q23)

**(b)** Was your most recent application for promotion at your current institution successful?

🔾 Yes 🔾 No

**(c)** Please **tell us** about any particularly **positive** aspect(s) of the promotion process

**(d)**   Please **tell us** about any particularly **negative** aspect(s) of the promotion process

**21.**  If you have been promoted while at your current institution, please indicate how important the following criteria were in assessing your promotion

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very important | Fairly important | Fairly unimportant | Not important | Don't know |
| **a.** Teaching activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **b.** Research activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **c.** Leadership & administration activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |
| **d.** Community engagement activities | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 | 🔾 |

**22.**  Please **describe** any other activities/criteria that were taken into account for your promotion.

**23.**  Any other comments?

*Thank you*





# 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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# template #6

**diamond ranking activities for promotion workshops**

#### Purpose

Diamond ranking (see Clark, 2012, for a full discussion) is a tool drawn from thinking skills pedagogies which is designed to explore participants’ sense of hierarchy in relation to a set of ideas or images. Participants are provided with a number of cards containing statements or ideas and asked to arrange them in a diamond formation (see Figure 1). The criteria for sorting are not rigidly fixed but descriptors that are frequently used include important, interesting, better or significant. One of these criteria is then used to rank the most “interesting”, “important” statement at the top, the next most interesting in an equal position in the second row and so on until the last statement, the least “interesting” or “important” is placed at the bottom.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |

Figure 1: Diamond ranking sheets for discussion of the Promoting Teaching set of Good Practice Examples

As a discussion tool, this diamond as an ‘end product’ enables participants to crystallise their priorities and can scaffold action planning, whilst as a research tool, the placement lends itself to quantitative analysis. It is typically a collaborative activity, as the discussions about where to place elements and why are as important to elucidating the thinking as the final diamond, meaning that the complexity of action planning can be addressed as well as providing qualitative analysis opportunities. One of the cards is usually blank, or an extra blank card is provided so that participants can introduce their own ideas.

#### Ranking the Good Practice Examples

**Two** sets of cards are provided as exercises to facilitate discussion about promotion for teaching: Good Practice Examples and Evidence Cards. Template #7 provides double-sided sheets of these cards to run through your photocopier or send to a printing company. Guillotine the sheets in order to make up extra sets of cards for the activity, one set per group.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Good practice example7.jpg | Good practice example9.jpg | RMIT.PNG |

Fifteen Good Practice Example cards can be used to stimulate discussion around institutional priorities. Provide a sixteenth blank card so that participants can write an example from their own university.

#### Ranking the Evidence Cards

A second set of ten cards is included in this pack, each card describing an example of evidence of achievement in teaching drawn from Promoting Teaching’s Evidence Framework: *Making Teaching Count*. These can be used by a workshop facilitator to stimulate discussion about the nature of evidence in teaching. The facilitator would need to prepare a diamond sheet with 10 empty spaces.



Clark, J. (2012) Using diamond ranking as visual cues to engage young people in the research process. Qualitative Research Journal 12(2), 222-237.





# template #7

memorandum of understanding

**[Insert Partner Institution logos as header]**

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING**

**between**

**[insert partner institution names]**

In order to advance co-operative benchmarking, institutional self evaluation and quality improvement, the University of [insert partner institution name/s] and the [insert partner institution name/s] (“the parties”) agree to enter into this Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) based on the following principles:

* Mutual respect;
* A willingness to share and learn from each other; and
* A shared commitment to quality management.

Benchmarking is integral to ongoing quality improvement and, for the purposes of this MOU, is defined as the process of identifying and learning from good or best practices used by other organisations to achieve optimal and sustainable results and outcomes (reference: Council of Australian University Librarians).

The focus of the benchmarking partnership is Academic Promotion with a view to identifying good practice and quality improvements.

1. **Objective**

The parties intend, within available finances and resources, to pursue effective and ethical co-operative benchmarking, consistent with the parties’ reputations for excellence and integrity in education, research and scholarship, for the benefit of all parties. To achieve this objective, the parties intend to undertake benchmarking activities and will endeavour to:

* Discuss the expectations of each proposed benchmarking activity prior to commencement of that activity, with a view to establishing mutual interest and benefits for all parties
* Provide and share the same type and level of information that each request of the other and as agreed;
* Provide open, honest assessments of the benchmarking activity;
* Complete each benchmarking activity to the satisfaction of all parties as agreed and in a timely manner;
* Work within mutually agreed procedures; and
* Designate a liaison officer to develop and coordinate the specific activities agreed upon.

1. **Confidentiality**

A party must not make any public announcement or statement or publish or release any information in relation to any proposed benchmarking activity without the prior written approval of the other parties.

Each party will keep confidential any information that it receives from another party which is marked confidential or which a party notifies the other party is confidential.

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein, the undertakings hereby given shall not prevent the Recipient disclosing to any third Party, or using, any Confidential Information which:

* The Recipient can demonstrate by reference to written records was known to it before being disclosed or obtained in connection with this MOU without any obligation to keep it confidential; or
* Is, at the time of being disclosed or obtained in connection with this MOU, or at any time thereafter and through no fault of the Recipient becomes, public knowledge; or
* Is, at any time after being disclosed or obtained in connection with this MOU, lawfully obtained by the Recipient from any third Party without any obligation by the Recipient to maintain such information in confidence; or
* The Recipient can demonstrate by reference to written records is independently developed by it without reference to any Confidential Information; or
* The Recipient is legally compelled to disclose, in which event the Recipient must use its best endeavours to provide the disclosing Party with prompt, prior notice of such requirement so that the disclosing Party may seek a protective order or other appropriate remedy and/or waive compliance with the terms of this MOU. In the event that such protective order or other remedy is not obtained, or that the disclosing Party waives compliance with the provisions hereof, the Recipient agrees to furnish only the portion of the Confidential Information that is legally required.

This provision shall survive the termination of this MOU.

1. **Intellectual Property**

Intellectual property owned and created by a party and shared with the other parties under this MOU remains the property of that party. All such intellectual property should be treated as confidential and not for public circulation unless specifically agreed otherwise by both parties.

The parties agree that all rights relating to any intellectual property developed in the course of any benchmarking activities under this MOU shall be negotiated and dealt with separately to this MOU and will be recorded and governed by a separate document executed by the relevant parties.

This provision shall survive the termination of this MOU.

1. **Use of name and logo**

A party shall not use the name or logo, or any variation thereof, of another party without first obtaining that other party’s written consent.

This provision shall survive the termination of this MOU.

1. **Duration**

This MOU will be effective for a period of [insert term] years from the date of last signature and may be extended or varied by mutual agreement of the parties.

1. **Termination**

A party may terminate this MOU by providing a minimum of 6 months written notice to the other parties, unless an earlier termination date is mutually agreed upon.

1. **No Partnership**

This MOU is not intended to be and shall not be construed to create or give effect to a joint venture, association, partnership or other business organisation or agency arrangement and no Party shall have the authority under this MOU to bind another without the prior written approval of the other Party.

1. **Not Legally Binding**

The purpose of this MOU is only to express the intentions of the parties. Only clauses 2, 3, and 4 are intended to be legally binding on any party. All other clauses are not intended to be legally binding.

Any claim which is brought by a Party against another Party under the provisions of this MOU shall be construed and interpreted under and in accordance with the law of the country in which the Party against which the claim is made is established.

[Insert partner institution signatures: agreements should be signed by Vice-Chancellors or equivalent]