**Academic Processes Review: Some Comments on Template Applications**

**Christine Ennew: Application on R&T Track**

This exemplifies a ‘rounded’ application that scores across all categories. Minimum scores for each category are met, and the overall score of 22 easily exceeded.

*Research & Scholarship*

This nicely bridges profiles that might be presented from different departments around quantity & quality. Warwick Business School specifically is likely to present two types of profile. One profile shows a large number of publications in category 4 within an institutionalised ‘Academic Journal Guide’ produced by the Chartered Association of Business Schools (CABS), another profile might have less publications but in the very highest category 4 star/world elite. Unlike clinical sciences for example, citation metrics are less used with business schools, but nevertheless there is a move towards their use. The application aligns with the former profile. Note Economics for example tends towards a smaller number of publications but that are considered world elite within their community. Extending consideration outside business and economics, readers of applications might be alert to contextual differences around the quantity/quality dimension and use of citation metrics.

Unusually for a business school academic, specifically in marketing, research income is significant. Most business school academics are not grant getters, although there are differences across business school subjects.

For a business school academic, note the PhD supervision completion is astounding at the professorial application stage of a career.

Overall, the applicant appears rather modest in their claim to score at band 7. This might be viewed as band 8. However, at band 7, it meets the minimum.

*Teaching & Learning*

Evidence is provided about teaching performance in terms of scores awarded by students. This is desirable, an applicant may be telling us about their ‘high’ performance but not showing us evidence.

Also positive is detail about innovation in pedagogy, which, given greater policy emphasis upon teaching excellence, we might expect to increasingly feature in applications.

Note that some applicant claims may fit more than one category. For example, launching a professional doctorate (DBA in a business school context) could appear under the ‘Collegiality, Leadership & Management’ category.

Overall, again, the applicant appears rather modest in their claim of band 6. This might be viewed as band 7. However, as above, for R&T promotion it exceeds minimum score band 5.

*Collegiality, Leadership & Management*

Given the size of business schools, there are obviously more managerial responsibilities, but at the same time, there are a large number of faculty that may fill these roles. Hence, the application is unusual in the significance and number of leadership and managerial roles enacted. Note a ‘division’ may be the same size as a department in arts and humanities for example. Business school deputy directorship is likely a significant role and a business school PhD programme large. The applicant has also fulfilled faculty and university roles. Hence, the applicant’s claim of band 8 in this category is justified and significantly exceeds minimum score of 4 under this category.

*Impact, Outreach & Engagement*

Some departments more easily show impact than others. However, it should not be assumed that a business school is a more vocational department where faculty readily generate practice or policy impact. In this light, professional journal publication, consultancy, and reports for the potato marketing board should be seen in a positive light, and the minimum band score of 4 is easily exceeded taking this into account. Indeed, the applicants’ judgement of band 5 may be modest given engagement with the wider scholarly community through external examinership of 16 PhDs, membership of two editorial boards and the reputation indicator of visiting professorship at one of the prestigious Indian Institutes of Management.

**Mark Knights:** **Application on R&T Track**

This represents an application with research and scholarship standing out, but with also considerable merit for teaching and learning. Minimum scores for each category are met, and the overall score of 22 easily exceeded.

*Research & Scholarship*

When compared to the application above, we can see contextual differences in terms of the types of publication that might be rated by various departments. Business schools commonly privilege peer-reviewed journal publications. Arts and humanities departments, such as history, are commonly more pluralist. This application highlights a range of research outputs, encompassing academic monographs, book chapters, and a large number of peer-reviewed journal publications. The quality of the first of these is evidenced by positive reviews received in well-established outlets for the academic monographs. We might expect citation evidence, but like business schools (and unlike medical schools for instance), citation metrics are not institutionalised in the domain of application. Nevertheless, it is clear in the quantity of outputs, as well as their quality, that the applicant’s claimed score of band 8 in this category is well merited.

Alongside the above, the band 8 claim is buttressed by, what is for an arts and humanities department like history, very impressive grant capture. However, at least in the Warwick context, grant capture in arts and humanities seems a common feature at all faculty levels.

*Teaching & Learning*

Evidence is provided about teaching performance in terms of scores awarded by students. This is desirable, an applicant may be telling us about their ‘high’ performance but not showing us evidence.

Also positive is detail about innovation in pedagogy, which, given greater policy emphasis upon teaching excellence, we might expect to increasingly feature in applications. That pedagogical innovation is supported by a HEFCE award reflects its national reach.

In the light of the above, the applicant is rather modest in their assessment of band 6 under this category. This might be viewed as band 7. However, as above, for R&T promotion it exceeds minimum score band 5.

*Collegiality, Leadership & Management*

Leadership is exhibited regarding research, with grant capture and associated capacity building. This may be viewed as double counting under two categories, the other being research and scholarship. Nevertheless, we might be accommodating on such matters.

*Impact, Outreach & Engagement*

Regional outreach and engagement is particularly exhibited, but the applicant might demonstrate its impact upon, for example, public understanding of research.

Developing a system for data access reflects outreach activity.

Again, the minimum band score of 4 for this category is easily exceeded.

**Matthew Keeling:** **Application on R&T Track**

This represents an application with research and scholarship standing out, but with also considerable merit for the category of impact, outreach and engagement. Minimum scores for each category are met, and the overall score of 22 easily exceeded. Generally, the applicant might have been bolder in their claims and the evidence presented.

*Research & Scholarship*

This represents a very accessible case under this category for a non-specialist to read. The evidence and its quality are very clear regarding amount of research grant awards and publications. Given the application lies in the domain of biology and mathematics, we might expect some citation impact detail.

The very top journal, Nature, is highlighted, as is a research monograph, with the published, Princeton Press reflecting the quality of the monograph. Alongside this, reviews of the monograph from top academics may have been cited, and/or citations in general, to evidence its’ high quality.

While the applicant has a limited number of PhD completions, nevertheless capacity building in the realm of research and scholarship is evident through development of the largest research group in Biological Sciences/Mathematics.

Research and scholarly standing in the field is demonstrated by membership of funding commissioning bodies, specifically Wellcome. Finally, the applicant’s intellectual standing is evidenced by a Philip Leverhulme Prize in Mathematics award, one of only six in the UK.

Overall, the claim for band 8 under research and scholarship is well justified.

*Teaching & Learning*

While the applicant tells the reader what they do regarding teaching, there is little evidence provided regarding its quality, merely a short statement alluding to all teaching rated as above 4 out of 5 students. We might assume this would follow in the accompanying cv, but this is not the case. So, while band 4 represents the minimum required for this category for promotion within R&T track, nevertheless this proves difficult to judge in the absence of evidence about quality of teaching. There is an absence of description of any pedagogical innovation. However, the development of research-based text for students can be viewed positively.

Overall, the minimum score is reached of 4, but any claim beyond this might be enhanced by provision of more evidence.

*Impact, Outreach & Engagement*

The applicant’s description is short here, but it allows the very significant impact made around disease prevention to stand out. In this category, evidence is provided to back the applicant’s claim of a band 6 in this category, with two very clear examples of significant impact provided through participation in government bodies, for example to control the spread of foot and mouth disease and the West Nile virus. The international reach of the applicant’s impact can be seen in the invited speech to G8 scientific advisory board members. Overall, the applicant proves rather modest in their claim, and this might be viewed as band 7 evidence.

*Collegiality, Leadership & Management*

The minimum score of band 4 is evidenced. More detail might have been provided about impact of leadership for the Ecology and Epidemiology Group, and the applicant might have ‘double counted’ for leadership of the research group that crosses biology and mathematics in evidencing their score under this category.

**Gwen van der Velden:** **Application on Teaching Only Track**

This is an application that scores well across three categories, with claim of band score rather modestly presented. The application easily meets the minimum band in each category, and the overall score of 22. As might be expected under Teaching Track application, the claimed band for teaching and learning is high.

*Research & Scholarship*

The case tells the reader about research and scholarship, but does not show evidence. We might expect evidence to appear in the cv.

For the teaching promotion track, we might expect evidence to be more pluralist, and not reliant on traditional academic publications, and indeed the focus of research and scholarship might be upon pedagogical matters consistent with the career track. Thus, that much of the case for research and scholarship is based upon policy reports about pedagogy seems relevant.

Regarding policy reports, there is some double counting as these also appear under the category of impact, outreach and engagement. However, this seems fine. That at least one of the policy reports is externally funded by a government agency buttresses the intellectual case.

For the level of Professor, we might privilege national level reports, but there seems some good quality research-based institutional level (beyond department) reports that influence practices. I would rate these as admissible for the claim.

The minimum score of 4 is more than justified.

*Teaching & Learning*

As with some of the detail in other categories, much of the evidence is derived from the previous institution that employed the applicant. There may be a question of value-added since joining Warwick that justifies further promotion following recruitment. However, the new criteria allow for the longstanding case to be considered that extends beyond Warwick employment.

The development of institutional level strategies and operational plans beyond the department, and structures (such as a student advisory service and academic skills centre) can be seen in a very positive light, as might the applicant being an early mover in the development of MOOCs.

However, the sources of funding for teaching enhancement are not clear. If we assume that some of this is external, then the applicant’s reputation and influence at national level is evidenced.

As might be expected in an application under the teaching track, the applicant’s claim is high with maximum band 8. This is justified.

*Impact, Outreach & Engagement*

The applicant proves rather modest in their claim of band 5, and this might be viewed as band 7 evidence given the range of national policy roles as expert in domains that are currently ‘hot’, such as NSS. Further, international policy level influence is evident, specifically in India and Australia.

*Collegiality, Leadership & Management*

The applicant proves rather modest in their claim of band 6, and this might be viewed as band 7 or even band 8 evidence. The applicant’s role as Director of Learning and Teaching Enhancement in their previous institution is very significant. There is also claims of significant capacity building, with some modest evidence to support this.