

Teaching Recognition and Reward.

Briefing Paper – September 2017

Executive Summary

Ongoing work by WIHEA's *Teaching Recognition & Reward (TR&R) Learning Circle* has sought to investigate the current understanding of the key issues pertaining to this subject across the UK and International HE sector with a view to informing discussion and initiatives for development and change within Warwick University. The study to date has involved a review of the subject literature, engagement with seminars and workshops organised by bodies such as the HEA and an analysis of the relative merits of the approaches adopted by a range of selected other institutions.

Key findings to date include:

- There is a wealth of current scholarship on methods to recognise and reward excellent teaching which should inform discussions at Warwick.
- There is substantial evidence for (and acknowledgement of) the fact that in a significant range of HE institutions the importance of teaching has been overshadowed by research. This has almost certainly been exacerbated by the focus on REF performance, particularly amongst Russell Group institutions. The introduction of TEF has made redressing this imbalance an urgent necessity.
- Whilst Warwick has historically benchmarked its performance against competitors within its own mission group, there is strong evidence that more balanced approaches to the recognition and promotion of good teaching practices are to be found elsewhere in the HE sector, notably a number of the 'Post-92' institutions. This has recently been reflected in the initial TEF rankings.
- Warwick appears to be lagging behind some other Russell Group universities who have addressed or in the process of addressing reward, recognition and promotion for good teaching practices.
- Across such institutions a common denominator seems to be the appreciation that promotion criteria should provide equal opportunities across the range of different academic activities. These are usually identified as research-led (R), teaching-led (T) or (importantly) a blend of the two (T&R). It therefore seems critical to determine measures and criteria relating to demonstrable excellence in each of these streams of activity.
- There is considerable movement in the sector with many institutions (both in the UK and overseas) considering processes for the recognition and reward of teaching excellence and changing their own policies and procedures.
- Teaching and learning continues to be impacted by the inexorable rise in the availability of access to communications technology as have many aspects of human activity. The UK environment for HEIs has also been affected by policy changes regarding student fees which have contributed to greater focus on value for money.

Introduction

The WIHEA-founded *Teaching Recognition & Reward (TR&R) Learning Circle* was initiated in early 2017 with members including WIHEA Fellows from several Warwick Departments.

Its purpose is to inform institutional deliberations on issues of:

- Recognition and reward of teaching.
- Teaching career development and
- Parity of research and teaching.

It aims to provide scholarly, evidence-based advice and input to the institutional consideration of these issues, by offering a systematic review and critical appraisal of the corpus of research conducted in this field in recent decades. Activities to date have included:

- A review of relevant literature (an illustrative bibliography is included as an appendix to this briefing paper).
- A benchmarking exercise against selected institutions.

Progressing with the work, it is a further intention to engage the WIHEA Fellowship in focus groups to gather structured data that may best represent the current situation across the institution as well as the aspirations of the teaching academy. It is also intended that a symposium will be organised (through WIHEA) with key presenters in the field (intended for early December 2017), calling upon:

- Cherry Bennett (Assistant HR Director, Reading University)
- Sue Robson NTF/ Steve McHanwell NTF (Newcastle University) HEA ‘Promoting Teaching’ project
- Vikki Burns (University of Birmingham) Participant in Universitas 21 (global network of research-intensive universities) project on teaching and promotion.

Analysis of Other Institutions

Selection Criteria

Initially, institutions for benchmarking were drawn from;

- The Russell Group
- Gold Standard Institutions from the recent ‘mock TEF’ exercise
- HEA ‘Mission Groups’

This produced a list of approximately 80 institutions across the HE sector. These were subjected to a ‘coarse filter’, subsequent selection depending on a range of criteria, including (but not limited to) the availability of information on their promotional criteria and procedures to the ‘outside world’. This resulted in the following derived shortlist of 14 institutions’ for closer investigation of their practices:

Aston	Brown, USA	Monash, Australia	Sheffield	Warwick
Birmingham	Coventry	Queen’s, Belfast, N.I.	Wellesley, USA	Bristol
Leeds	Reading	Swansea	York	

These 14 institutions have then been benchmarked along guidelines established by the HEA ‘Promoting Teaching’ project (see Table 1, below).

Evidence Provided by Supervisor/Head/Dean Position/performance expectation Head’s evaluation (eg classroom observations) Course/Subject Evaluations	Evidence Relating to Impact on Students Statement of teaching philosophy Teacher/subject/course evaluations Student learning outcomes Other
Evidence Relating to Staff Development Completion of tertiary teaching preparation course Completion of formal qualification in teaching Attendance at teaching-related workshops Other	Evidence Relating to Curriculum Development Resource development Subject/course development or curriculum review Innovation Textbook Other

Evidence Relating to Peer Evaluation or Recognition Peer observations of teaching Teaching awards or citations Peer evaluations of curriculum Referee reports Other	Evidence Relating to the Scholarship of Teaching Statement on scholarship direction Application of a scholarly approach Peer-reviewed publications Presenter or workshop leader Grants Other
Evidence Relating to Teaching/Research Nexus UG research engagement Research Student Completions Other	Evidence Relating 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 Other

Table 1: Comparator Table of benchmarking criteria (HEA).

In-depth Analysis of 14 Selected Institutions

Using the criteria from the HEA paper the 14 selected institutions have been analysed in more detail alongside an assessment of Warwick's current criteria. Elements of good practice have been highlighted (such as the use of lists of evidence, or differential weighting of evidence).

Key Findings:

Aston	Provides numerous examples of possible evidence in Promotions Procedure booklet. Expects evidence of increasing levels of recognised qualifications (PGCPP, FHEA, SFHEA, PFHEA, NTF). Looks for evidence of impact. For senior promotions (Reader/Chair) internal referees and external assessors are required including at least one international commentator.
Birmingham	Three types of role identified: researcher lecturer; teaching and research lecturer; and teaching focussed lecturer. Excellent role descriptions demonstrating evidence needed for teaching/admin promotion,
Bristol	Members of staff on Pathways 1 or 3, at Lecturer or Teaching Fellow (level C), will not be able to apply for promotion/accelerated progression without having at least successfully completed level 1 standard route of CREATE (or equivalent) and be enrolled on level 2. SL are required to have successfully completed level 2 experienced route of CREATE, or have completed the PGCert TLHP, or have gained Recognition of Prior Qualification via the Academic Staff Development team.
Brown	Criteria created at a school level. Asks for 'documented qualities as a teacher of students'
Coventry	Promotion based on recognition of a high level of achievement in four broad areas of activity: Teaching and Learning; Research and Scholarship; Enterprise; Leadership and Management. Applications are required to be based on at least two of these areas of activity and typically two or three (including Leadership and Management). Key considerations include evidence of both excellence in current role and key capabilities consistent with the higher grade. For Readerships and Professorships, whilst evidence of 'research' is required, the interpretation of the term is expressly broad and includes "...pedagogical innovation of distinction which

	<i>is recognised externally."</i>
Leeds	Academic promotion (grades 7- 10) divided into two routes (Student Education and Research and Innovation). Promotion to Grade 10 (Chair) can also be on the basis of Excellence in Academic Leadership. The University of Leeds has recently updated their promotion process as a result of staff feedback. The process is now fully explained in one online location with links to documents and guidance and to one-to-one support (all fully visible to external users). The two routes for academic promotion (and three routes to promotion to Chair) and the use of core and enhanced criteria for each grade allows considerable flexibility.
Monash	Have different weightings for Teaching & Research, Teaching only & Research only with special emphasis on engagement, Research only, Education focused. All need to provide evidence of research, teaching and engagement in different proportions.
Queen's Belfast	Promotion applications without evidence from teaching evaluations are not considered. Promotion clinics are provided for applicants. Job roles are annotated as "Education" rather than "Teaching only". Promotion criteria distinguish between essential and non-essential. Lack in one essential criterion can be compensated evidence at a higher level in another.
Reading	Well defined criteria for Promotion through Teaching and Learning Route - Titles are same across the board i.e. Associate Prof/Prof for T&L, Research and Academic Citizenship & Leadership,
Sheffield	Emphasis on structured reflection (The full scope of reflection covers consideration of subject matter, the choice of pedagogy, teaching delivery, and assessment methods. Key to this process is reflection on student outcomes both during and after teaching delivery with such reflections influencing the planning of future teaching.) Also worthy of note is the use of a dedicated promotion mentor.
Swansea	Three academic career pathways based on excellence in Research (R), Teaching & Scholarship (T) or Innovation and Engagement (I&E). All academics must demonstrate Teaching, Research & Management at core level and choose a pathway of excellence (R, T or I&E). Four clear criteria (Teaching delivery and review; Teaching innovation; Esteem; Advancing Practice) with indicative performance levels and suggested examples at each grade for 'core' and 'enhanced'. They hold an annual University promotion recognition event for those successful.
Warwick	Relatively complex and not very clear process. For example there are two routes recognising teaching proficiency and teaching excellence for R & T staff but not clear if there are different weightings between the two. A range of possible evidence listed.
Wellesley	Personal statement required with evidence of 'teaching excellence'.
York	Structured reflection and student feedback required

Table 2: Key findings from review of 14 selected institutions' promotion criteria.

Engagement with relevant Symposia / Workshops

'Illuminating the Learning and Teaching Promotional Pathway' Joint Symposium, Cardiff Metropolitan University and HEA, Monday 6th March 2017:

Speakers included Prof Scott Fleming, (Director of Research & Grad. Studies at Cardiff Met. University), Alison Robinson-Canham (HEA Assistant Director Professional Practice), Prof Steve McHanwell (Director of Unit for Educational R&D and Practice at Newcastle Uni.), Professor Jon Scott (PVC for Student Experience at Leicester University), Dr Rachael-Anne Knight (Associate Dean for Education Technology and Innovation at City Uni.) and Cherry Bennett (Assistant Director of HR at University of Reading).

Main Criteria Identified in Group Discussions:

- Sustained evidence of impact on T&L
- Transparency of routes/criteria/decision making
- Recognition indicators of esteem / influence (reputation?)
- Reach and impact beyond own institution
- Contextualised to HEI / discipline (institutional 'priority')
- Inclusivity / non-discriminatory

Ideas for Enablers Identified in Group Discussions

- Mentorship – good role models – networking
- Celebrate success
- Visibility of promotion scheme / promotion criteria
- Strategic rotation of 'improving' roles and responsibilities to create opportunities for career development
- Fair constitution of promotion panels

"Invest in people or they might leave. *Don't* invest in people and they might *stay!*"

Continuing Initiatives:

Qualitative Feedback from WIHEA fellows on Warwick Promotion Criteria

A questionnaire for WIHEA fellows is being prepared to gather qualitative feedback on promotions policies and practices at Warwick.

Appendix A

Illustrative Bibliography

Some key texts within the field have been identified as follows:

1. *"Excellent education in research-rich universities"*:
D. Fung, J. Besters-Dilger and R. van der Vaart, LERU, Feb. 2017
<http://www.leru.org/files/general/LERU%20Position%20Paper%20Excellent%20Education.pdf>
Provides eight key principles for research-rich institutions to consider including strategies that enhance the synergies between research and student education; regarding excellent teaching and education-focused scholarship as on a par with excellent research; fostering culture of quality and enhancement; reward and recognition of excellent teaching; and empowering students to become leaders and agents of change.
2. *"Rewarding Educators and Education Leaders in Research Intensive Universities"*
D. Fung and C. Gordon, HEA 2016
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/rewarding_educators_and_education_leaders.pdf
Considers drivers for change; job families and opportunities for promotion; promotion criteria and their application; professional development, recognition and reward; student engagement; pedagogical scholarship and research-based education.
3. *"Reward and recognition for university teaching in STEM subjects"*
S. Gretton and D. Raine, Journal of Further and Higher Education, 2015
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2015.1100714>
A study of 'teaching-only' staff in STEM disciplines which concludes there is an enthusiastic workforce that feel undervalued by the system.
4. *"Relationship between research and teaching: a meta analysis"*
J. Hattie and H.W. Marsh, Review of Educational Research Winter 1996, Vol.66, No.4. pp507-542
An older article which summarises all the literature to date (1996) on the relationship between research and teaching.
5. *"Recognition of good university teaching: policies from an Australian study"*
P. Ramsden and E. Martin, Studies in Higher Education, Volume 21, 1996 - Issue 3.
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075079612331381231>
Demonstrates that staff consider research and teaching activities do not receive equal weighting in reward and recognition processes. Suggests recommendations for policy changes which will require 'visionary leadership [and] build on existing academic values and expectations, combining changes to organisational climates with changes to reward systems and employment practices.'
6. *"Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of scholarship of teaching in HE"*
D. Chalmers, Higher Education Research & Development, Vol. 30 2011 – Issue 1
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07294360.2011.536970>
Assesses the progress that has been made across the sector in recognising and rewarding the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SOTL).
7. *"Disciplinary differences and University teaching"*
R. Neumann, Studies in Higher Education, Vol. 26 2001 – Issue 2
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/03075070120052071>
Considers the importance of the 'discipline' in understanding and rewarding teaching excellence.
8. *"Developing the digital literacies of academic staff"*
B. Newland and F. Handley, Research in Learning Technology, Published online Oct. 2016
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.3402/rlt.v24.31501>
Considers the development of a digital literacy framework for academic staff at the University of Brighton and its use in professional development and promotion processes.

9. *"Digital lens on the UK PSF"*
H. Beetham, JISC Draft for consultation, Revised August 2015
<http://blog.yorks.ac.uk/tel/files/2013/12/DigitalLensontheUKPSF.pdf>
Discussion paper on using digital capabilities as evidence for the UK Professional Standards Network.
10. *"On recognition and respect"*
M. Murphy, Educational future, Vol.2(2) January 2010
<http://educationstudies.org.uk/journal/ef/volume-2-2-2010/recognition-respect-honneth-intersubjectivity-education/murphyf2/>
A philosophical study of the struggle for academic recognition.
11. *"Promoting Teaching - Bench Marking Guide"* (HEA Promoting Teaching Project, 2014)
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/resources/benchmarking_guide_web.pdf
Templates for institutions to use promoting teaching benchmarks to self-review against sector good practice and to compare themselves to comparator institutions.
12. *"Promoting Teaching - Making Evidence Count"* (HEA Promoting Teaching Project, 2013)
https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/making-evidence-count-web_0.pdf
An evidence framework to assist HE providers to clarify evidence of teaching achievement at different academic promotion levels.
13. *"What makes great teaching? – Review of the underpinning research"*
Robert Coe, Cesare Aloisi, Steve Higgins and Lee Elliot Major, October 2014
<http://www.suttontrust.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/What-Makes-Great-Teaching-REPORT.pdf>
Aimed mainly at schools but seeks to define the principles that make great teaching.