

Managing Teaching Performance

Report of a Leadership Foundation Fellowship Project conducted at Queen Mary, University of London 2006/07

Fellowship Holder:

Professor Morag Shiach, Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning)

Research Team:

Professor Morag Shiach, Vice-Principal (Teaching and Learning)
Dr Steve Ketteridge, Director of Educational and Staff Development
Dr Matthew Williamson, Teaching Quality Adviser, ESD
Mr Leigh Ward, Executive Officer (Teaching and Learning)

**Leadership
Foundation**

for Higher Education



Queen Mary
University of London





Contents

1 Executive summary	04	6 Research reports on participating higher education institutions	12
2 Summary of project aims	05	6.1 The University of Sydney	12
3 Context of project	06	6.2 The University of Melbourne	14
4 Description and justification of methodology	07	6.3 Monash University	16
4.1 Methodology	7	6.4 The University of Western Australia	18
4.2 Key facts about participating higher education institutions	7	6.5 Lund University and Göteborg University	21
4.2.1 The University of Sydney	7	6.6 The University of Aberdeen	22
4.2.2 The University of Melbourne	7	6.7 The University of Bath	23
4.2.3 Monash University	8	6.8 University College London	25
4.2.4 The University of Western Australia	8	7 Conclusions	28
4.2.5 Lund University	8	7.1 Use of student satisfaction data	28
4.2.6 Göteborg University	8	7.2 Excellent teaching in research-intensive institutions	28
4.2.7 The University of Aberdeen	8	7.3 Promotion opportunities of staff with a teaching focus	28
4.2.8 The University of Bath	9	7.4 'Teaching portfolios'	29
4.2.9 University College London	9	7.5 Departmental and institutional culture	29
5 National organisations for the advancement of learning and teaching in higher education: Australia, Sweden and he UK	10	7.6 'Excellent university teaching'	29
5.1 Australia: the Carrick Institute	10	7.7 Indicators of teaching performance	29
5.2 Sweden: Lund University, LTH Pedagogical Academy	10	Appendix A Indicators of teaching performance	30
5.3 UK: Higher Education Academy	11	Appendix B Implementation plan	32
		Appendix C Dissemination plan	33

1. Executive summary

This project investigates approaches to encouraging, assessing and rewarding excellent teaching in a range of research-intensive universities.

The research team visited HEIs in the UK, in Australia and in Sweden. In each case, the team explored the ways in which the measurement of teaching performance informed HR policies and procedures; considered the approaches to enhancing teaching quality at departmental and/or individual level; and reviewed the use of the measurement of teaching performance to support the achievement of larger strategic goals.

The project was undertaken by staff at Queen Mary, University of London, a research-intensive institution and one of the largest multi-faculty colleges of the University of London with almost 13,000 UK and international students. Queen Mary was ranked 99th in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006. This project was timely for Queen Mary for a number of reasons. The College had recently adopted a new pay framework with contribution points for exceptional performance, and thus needed to identify transparent and robust methods for identifying outstanding contribution in the areas of teaching and the support of learning. The UK's National Student Survey had published results for the first time in 2005, which had generated new information about the performance of the College in areas of teaching and learning. Finally Queen Mary had launched a new *Strategic Plan* in 2006, which committed it to creating 'an outstandingly stimulating and innovative teaching and learning environment'. The project was designed to contribute to the achievement of this strategic objective.



Detailed reports on the findings from each HEI are available below. The key outcomes of the project are:

- The identification of 'indicators of teaching performance' for Queen Mary that can be used to assess the overall quality of teaching within a given academic department, and also to underpin a case for individual teaching excellence (see Appendix A)
- Increased understanding of the ways in which data on student satisfaction can be used successfully to underpin teaching enhancement.

- Insight into the ways in which rigorous analysis of desired 'graduate attributes' can facilitate the development of a shared culture of teaching excellence.
- Recognition that institutional and departmental cultures and structures are central to creating and sustaining opportunities for teaching excellence.
- Identification of excellent teaching as teaching that produces the best possible learning outcomes for students.

2. Summary of project aims

The aim of the LFF project 'Managing Teaching Performance' was to develop a customised set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), sensitive to the needs of research active universities, which could be used by Queen Mary, University of London to assess the contribution made by individual members of staff to teaching and the facilitation of student learning.

Whilst the project would be of interest across the UK HE sector, it was of particular relevance to research-active universities to enable them to produce performance standards to complement those used to assess the contribution of staff in research in connection with the UK's Research Assessment Exercise.

The project objectives were as follows:

- 1** To survey existing practices on assessing teaching performance in selected UK and overseas higher education institutions and to identify best practice;
- 2** To develop a framework for use by senior managers of KPIs for the assessment of individual teaching performance;

- 3** To lead in the implementation of the framework of KPIs at Queen Mary, University of London;
- 4** To evaluate fitness for purpose of the KPI Framework with stakeholders and assess any discriminatory impact on staff coming from different backgrounds, including disciplinary differences;
- 5** To disseminate the findings of this project through various means including publication of case study material, presentations to audiences of senior managers and web-based resources



3. Context of Project

Queen Mary, University of London is committed in its *Strategic Plan, 2006-10* to creating 'an outstandingly stimulating and innovative teaching and learning environment' and to teaching its students 'to the very highest academic standards, drawing on creative and innovative ways upon its research'. The College has developed a range of approaches to enhancing teaching and learning and to rewarding teaching excellence in recent years. It has developed accredited courses in academic practice, which all probationary teachers are required to complete. It has created a series of awards and prizes to recognise teaching innovation and teaching excellence, funded by the Drapers' Livery Company with whom the College has a close and longstanding relationship. It has instituted a high-profile annual lecture in learning and teaching as well as an annual 'learning and teaching day' involving a range of internal and external speakers. Various fellowship and small grant schemes have been created to fund innovations and developments in teaching and learning. The College's promotions criteria and generic job descriptions for academic roles have all been reviewed to ensure that contributions to teaching are duly recognised.

Despite these significant developments, however, there is currently no clear consensus within the College about the nature of excellent teaching, and limited confidence that it is always properly recognised and rewarded. The measurement of teaching performance does not appear



to all staff to have had the same robustness that is broadly accepted as governing the measurement of research performance. The measurement both of research and of teaching within higher education are complex processes that aim to encompass diversity of discipline and individual and collective contributions. The methodology for assessing research has been extensively debated and developed within the academic community over recent years and a consensus appears to have emerged that generates, for example, broad confidence in the integrity of judgements made as part of the RAE process. The conviction underlying this project was that a similar consensus over the measurement of teaching excellence would make a significant contribution to the further enhancement of teaching and learning across the College.

The project was shaped by particular approaches to the nature of excellent teaching in a research-intensive university. Excellent teaching was understood by the research team to be teaching that leads to the best possible learning outcomes for students and that also contributes to the achievement of the 'graduate attributes' we aspire to create for those successfully completing our undergraduate or postgraduate programmes. Excellent teaching is also informed by the research culture and methodology of the disciplines within which it takes place.

Excellent university teaching will tend to encourage active learning by students. While recognising that different forms of teaching and learning are appropriate within different disciplines, and for different purposes within those disciplines, this project did draw on the insights of researchers such as Graham Gibbs, Paul Ramsden, Mike Prosser, Keith Trigwell and Richard James, all of whom contributed in one way or another to the project. Their commitment to student-centred teaching and associated forms of 'deep learning' has been very influential in the context of UK and Australian universities, and has informed the 'indicators of excellence' generated as part of this project. For further details of these approaches to university teaching, see for example

M Prosser and K Trigwell: *Understanding Learning and Teaching: The Experience in Higher Education* (Open University Press, 1999); Graham Gibbs: *Improving Student Learning* (Oxford centre for Staff and Learning Development, 1996); and Paul Ramsden: *Learning to Teach in Higher Education* (Routledge, 2003). In addition, Graham Gibbs was kind enough to share some of the initial outputs of his current research project on departmental leadership and teaching excellence, which were very helpful in shaping the project's assessment of the relative importance of individual and departmental teaching excellence.

This project benefited greatly from the expertise and the generosity of its Advisory Group. The members of the Advisory Group were:

- Professor Gus Pennington – Chair of the Advisory Group
- Ms Heather Fry (Imperial College)
- Professor Michael Worton (University College London)
- Professor Chris Fowler (Queen Mary)
- Professor Evelyn Welch (Queen Mary)

All responded carefully to the project as it developed, advised on the design of its research methodology and on the selection of institutions; tested the initial findings and scrutinised the final report. This informed scrutiny encouraged the project team to defend and develop the insights generated by the research and enhanced the cogency and the utility of its conclusions.

The Leadership Foundation provided support for the project throughout the year, and the project team would like to record its thanks to Professor Stephanie Marshall and to Sarah Hubbard of the Leadership Foundation. In addition, Professor Bob Munn of the University of Manchester was appointed by the LF as coach to Professor Shiach, and in this role offered great insight and generous support both to her individually and to the project as a whole.

4. Description and Justification of Methodology

4.1. Methodology

Nine research-intensive institutions were visited to gain insight into how they recognise and support excellence in teaching. Of these, three were in the UK (University College London, Aberdeen and Bath), two were in Sweden (Lund and Goteborg) and four were in Australia (Melbourne, Monash, Sydney and the University of Western Australia). Sweden and Australia were selected because the availability of research literature on developments in these countries, and the UK institutions were selected as representing the University of London (UCL), the 94 Group of Universities (Bath) and a Scottish institution with a research and teaching mix similar to Queen Mary (Aberdeen).

No strong claim is made for the sample of institutions being representative. However, the insights gained from these institutions can be used to indicate common approaches and trends. It would of course be very difficult to establish significant representativeness of any sample of institutions, given the widely differing nature of the HE sector both in the UK and overseas.

In each university, interviews were arranged with a range of staff with responsibilities for the identification and reward of teaching excellence and with staff who had responsibility for the enhancement of teaching and learning. Staff interviewed ranged from PVCs (Teaching and Learning), to those with senior

responsibility for educational and staff development, those with senior responsibility for Human Resources, and Heads of large academic units.

Key areas of investigation were:

- Schemes to reward teaching excellence
- Promotion criteria
- Leadership of teaching
- HR strategies and Learning and Teaching Strategies
- Collective or individual teaching excellence
- Academic 'life-cycle' and teaching
- Capability criteria

This section is presented by country, with a brief snapshot of each visited being given, followed by an overview of the ways in which they measure, encourage, reward and embed excellence in teaching in the institution. After this, the main threads from the visits across the three countries are pulled together to create a picture of the methods used in these institutions, and to highlight similarities and differences of approach.

4.2. Key Facts about Participating Higher Education Institutions

4.2.1. The University of Sydney

The University of Sydney, founded in 1850, is Australia's oldest university.

In 2006, it had 45,039 student enrolments, which is 34,022 FTE. Of these, 11,018 are postgraduate enrolments and 2,900 are registered for higher degrees. 2,609 of the 5,921 staff of the institution are academic staff¹. Sydney has 12 faculties: Agriculture, Food and Natural Resources; Arts; Architecture, Design and Planning; Economics and Business; Education and Social Work; Engineering and Information Technologies; Health; Law; Science; The Sydney College of the Arts; Sydney Conservatorium of Music; and Veterinary Science.

Sydney is also a member of the Group of Eight leading Australian universities.

Sydney ranks at number 35 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.2. The University of Melbourne

The University of Melbourne was founded in 1853, and is the second oldest institution in Australia, and the oldest in the State of Victoria.

In 2005², it had 42,704 student enrolments, which is 34,008 FTE. Of these, 6,396 are postgraduate enrolments and 3,566 are registered for higher degrees. 3,060 of the 6,501 staff of the institution are academic staff³.

Melbourne has 13 faculties: Architecture, Building and Planning; Arts; Economics and Commerce; Education; Engineering; Land and Food Resources; Law; Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences; Melbourne Business School; Music; Science; Veterinary Science; and the Victorian College of the Arts.



1 All data is taken from the University of Sydney website at <http://www.planning.usyd.edu.au/statistics/>

2 Data for the University of Melbourne for 2006 is not yet available electronically.

3 All data is taken from the University of Melbourne website at <http://www.upo.unimelb.edu.au/>

Description and Justification of Methodology (cont)

Melbourne is also a member of the Group of Eight leading Australian universities.

Melbourne ranks at number 22 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.3. Monash University

Monash is the youngest of all the institutions studied for this project, having only been established by Act of Parliament in Australia in 1958. It first admitted students in 1961, and was the first university to be founded in the State of Victoria for 106 years. As well as its sites in Australia, Monash has campuses in Malaysia and South Africa and centres in London and Prato in Italy.

In 2006, it had 49,814 student enrolments, which is 35,667 FTE. Of these, 9,188 are postgraduate enrolments and 2,792 are registered for higher degrees. 3,001 of the 6,280 staff of the institution are academic staff.⁴

Monash has ten faculties: Art and Design; Arts; Business and Economics; Education; Engineering; Information Technology; Law; Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences; Pharmacy; and Science.

Monash is also a member of the Group of Eight leading Australian universities.



Monash ranks at number 38 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.4. The University of Western Australia

The University of Western Australia (UWA) was founded in 1911, and was the first university to be founded in the State of Western Australia. It is based in Perth, in the south-west of Australia.

In 2006, it had 17,538 student enrolments, which is 14,286 FTE. Of these, 4,095 are postgraduate enrolments and 1,981 are registered for higher degrees. 1,267 of the 3,018 staff of the institution are academic staff.⁵

UWA has nine faculties: Architecture, Landscape and Visual Arts; Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; Economics and Commerce; Education; Engineering, Computing and Mathematics; Law; Life and Physical Sciences; Medicine, Dentistry and Health Sciences; and Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

UWA, along with the other Australian institutions visited, is part of the Group of Eight, which represents Australia's leading universities. The Group of Eight have more than '70 per cent of national competitive research grants and conduct over 60 per cent of all Australian university research'⁶.

UWA ranks at number 111 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.⁷

4.2.5. Lund University

Lund University was founded in 1666, and was inaugurated in 1668. It is the second oldest university in Sweden, and one of only two to gain full university status before the 20th Century. It was re-incorporated in 1852 and has thereafter been government-funded. Lund is in the southeast of Sweden, about 20km north-west of Malmö.

In 2006, it had 40,600 students and 5,500 staff.⁷

Lund has eight faculties: Engineering; Science; Law; Social Sciences; Lund University School of Economics and Management; Medicine; Malmö Academies of Performing Arts; and Humanities and Theology.

Lund ranks at number 122 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.6. Göteborg University

Göteborg University was founded, as Göteborg University College, in 1891, and gained full university status in 1954. It is now the largest university in both Sweden and Scandinavia in terms of student numbers. It is located in the city of Göteborg, which is approximately 260km north of Lund on the east coast of Sweden.

In April 2007, it had 50,300 students, of which 2,584 were engaged in doctoral studies. Of the 5,000 staff, 2,446 are academic staff.⁹

Göteborg has eight faculties: Medicine, Odontology and Health and Care Sciences; Science; Arts; Fine, Applied and Performing Art; Social Sciences; Business, Economics and Law; Education; and the IT University.

Göteborg does not feature in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.7. The University of Aberdeen

The University of Aberdeen was founded in 1495, and is Scotland's third oldest institution and the fifth oldest in the United Kingdom. It merged with another Aberdeen University in 1860 to form the current University of Aberdeen.

4 The staff and total enrolment figures are taken from the Monash website at <http://www.monash.edu.au/about/stats.html>. Numbers on postgraduate and higher degree programmes are derived from data on this site.

5 All data is taken from the UWA website at http://www.stats.uwa.edu.au/StatsOffice/uwa_in_brief/uwa_in_brief_2006

6 Group of Eight, 2007. Available at URL: <http://www.go8.edu.au/about/facts.htm>

7 All THES data is taken from http://www.thes.co.uk/statistics/international_comparisons/2006/top_unis.aspx?window_type=popup

8 Far less data is available on Swedish institutions than on Australian, since not all of the institutions' sites have been translated in full from Swedish into English. Data on Lund is taken from <http://www.lu.se/o.o.i.s/3022>

9 Data is taken from http://www.gu.se/english/about_the_university/organisation/facts/

In 2006, it had 13,760 students, of whom 22 per cent study part-time. Aberdeen had 3,660 postgraduate students. Staff numbers for Aberdeen are not easily accessible.¹⁰

Aberdeen no longer has faculties, rather it comprises 11 Schools within three colleges: the College of Arts and Social Sciences – Schools of Divinity, History and Philosophy; Education; Language and Literature; Law; Social Science; and Aberdeen Business School. The College of Life Sciences and Medicine – Schools of Biological Sciences; Medical Sciences; Medicine; and Psychology. The College of Physical Sciences – Schools of Engineering and Physical Sciences; and Geosciences.¹¹

Aberdeen is not currently a member of any grouping of UK institutions.

Aberdeen ranks at number 195 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.8. The University of Bath

The University of Bath was granted a Royal Charter in 1966. It is one of the universities established in the UK following publication of the Robbins report in 1963.

In 2006, it had 11,965 students, of whom 15 per cent study part-time. Bath had 2980 postgraduate students, of whom 927 were studying for higher degrees. 1,402 of the 2570 staff are academic staff.¹²

Bath has five faculties: Engineering and Design; Humanities and Social Sciences; Science; Management; and Health.

It is a member of the 94 group of smaller research universities.

Bath ranks at number 153 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.

4.2.9. University College London

University College London (UCL) was founded in 1826 as the London University, and was the first university in England to admit students irrespective of class, race or religion, as well as being the first to admit women on equal terms with men. It became University College London in 1836 when it joined with King's College London to form the University of London.

In 2006, it had 21,620 students, of whom 16 per cent study part time. UCL had 9,650 postgraduate students and 4,000 academic and research staff.¹³

UCL has eight faculties: Arts and Humanities; the Built Environment; Biomedical Sciences; Engineering Sciences; Law; Life Sciences; Mathematical and Physical Sciences; and Social and Historical Sciences.

It is a member of the Russell Group of 20 major research-intensive institutions in the UK.

UCL ranks at number 25 in *The Times Higher Education Supplement (THES)* list of the top 200 universities in the world for 2006.



¹⁰ Data is taken from <http://www.hesa.ac.uk/holisdocs/pubinfo/student/institution0506.htm>

¹¹ Schools data is taken from <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/central/depts/schools.shtml>

¹² Data is taken from <http://www.bath.ac.uk/about/facts/>

¹³ Data is taken from <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/about-ucl/>

5. National Organisations for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: Australia, Sweden and UK

5.1. Australia: The Carrick Institute

The Carrick Institute, launched in August 2004 as The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, aims to promote and advance learning and teaching in Australian higher education through the following objectives:

- Promote and support strategic change in higher education institutions for the enhancement of learning and teaching, including curriculum development and assessment;
- Raise the profile and encourage recognition of the fundamental importance of teaching in higher education institutions and in the general community;
- Foster and acknowledge excellent teaching in higher education;
- Develop effective mechanisms for the identification, development, dissemination and embedding of good individual and institutional practice in learning and teaching in Australian higher education;
- Develop and support reciprocal national and international arrangements for the purpose of sharing and benchmarking learning and teaching processes; and
- Identify learning and teaching issues that influence the Australian higher education system and facilitate national approaches to address these and other emerging issues.

The Carrick Institute offers the following types of awards and schemes to support its objectives:

- Carrick Awards for Australian University Teaching (CAAUT)
- Carrick Fellowship Scheme
- Discipline Based Initiatives
- Grants Scheme
- Resource Identification and Networking (RIN)

Further information on the Carrick Institute can be found at:

www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/go

5.2. Sweden: Lund University, LTH Pedagogical Academy

There is no national organisation for the advancement of teaching and learning in Sweden. This kind of work tends to be organised at a local institutional level such as the Pedagogical Academy in the Faculty of Engineering (LTH) at Lund University.

The main aim of the Pedagogical Academy is to afford a higher status to pedagogical development at LTH and to demonstrate that LTH is an institute of higher education that focuses on students' learning and which systematically strives to improve the quality of its teaching.

University teachers (excluding postgraduate students) at LTH are assessed with the aim of being accepted into LTH's Pedagogical Academy. Those accepted into the Academy are awarded the distinction of Excellent Teaching Practitioner (ETP), and an immediate rise in salary. This payment is equivalent to the promotion of a lecturer to senior researcher (docent). The department



to which the member of staff belongs also receive an increase in their undergraduate teaching grant.

Applicants wishing to be admitted to the Academy must show how they have, over a period of time, consciously and systematically, endeavoured to develop means of enhancing students' learning in their discipline, and how they have made their own experience in teaching available to others in the academic community. Applicants must also be able to analyse and reflect on their teaching practices with the aid of pedagogic literature and other sources of information, and show how they have used these to develop their thoughts concerning teaching and the learning process.

5.3. UK: Higher Education Academy

In the UK, the Higher Education Academy (HEA) is the key organisation for the advancement of Learning and Teaching within higher education.

The HEA's role is to be a nationwide focus for enhancing teaching, learning and the student experience in higher education. They work with institutions, discipline groups and individual staff within the four countries of the UK and aim to help institutions, discipline groups and all staff in higher education to provide the best possible learning experience for students.

The HEA's strategic aims are to:

- be an authoritative and independent voice on policies that influence student learning experiences;
- support institutions in their strategies for improving the student learning experience;
- lead, support and inform the professional development and recognition of staff in higher education;
- promote good practice in all aspects of support for the student learning experience;
- lead the development of research and evaluation to improve the quality of the student learning experience;
- be a responsive, efficient and accountable organisation.

The Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) funds the HEA to undertake a number of activities specific to England and Northern Ireland, including e-learning, employer engagement and the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.

Further information on the HEA can be found at: www.heacademy.ac.uk/



6. Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions

6.1. The University of Sydney

Interviews were held at the University of Sydney with Professor Sally Andrews (Head, School of Psychology) and Dr Fiona White (Senior Lecturer, School of Psychology); Prof Richard Waterhouse (Head, School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry and Bicentennial Professor of Australian History); Prof Derrick Armstrong (Acting Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) and Dean of Education and Social Work); Associate Professor Anne Green and others (School of Physics). In addition, Rachel Symons (Special Projects Officer, Office of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)) contributed significant and useful information to the project.

Documents considered as part of the project were:

- University of Sydney: *Strategic Directions, 2006-2010*
www.usyd.edu.au/about/publication/strategic/2006/index.shtml
- University of Sydney: *Learning and Teaching Plan, 2007-2010*
www.usyd.edu.au/learning/planning/docs/landt_plan_2007-2010_print_version.pdf
- University of Sydney: *Academic Promotions 2006, Information Pack*
www.usyd.edu.au/learning/teaching_matters/academic_promotions.shtml

- University of Sydney: *Teaching Performance Indicators*
www.usyd.edu.au/learning/evaluating/tpi.shtml
- University of Sydney: *Scholarship Index*
www.usyd.edu.au/learning/quality/si.shtml
- University of Sydney School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry: *Teaching and Learning Plan (2005)*.
- University of Sydney School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry: *Research Plan (2005)*.
- University of Sydney: *Statement of Graduate Attributes*,
www.itl.usyd.edu.au/GraduateAttributes/statement.htm
- University of Sydney, *Analysis of the Student Experience: SCEQ/SREQ Taxonomy*.
- Rachel Symons, 'Getting the most out of the SCEQ data: meeting the needs of multiple stakeholders', paper presented at the Evaluation Forum, University of Melbourne, Australia (November 2004).
- Rachel Symons, 'In Their Own Words: finding out what students think about their university learning experience'.
- Rachel Symons, 'Listening to the student voice at the University of Sydney: closing the loop in the quality enhancement and improvement cycle', paper presented at the 2006 Australian Association for Institutional Research (AAIR) Forum, Coffs Harbour NSW (November 2006).

The University of Sydney: *Learning and Teaching Plan, 2007-2010* stresses the importance of further developing student-centred, research-led and innovative teaching. Its underlying principles include excellence, academic freedom, diversity and intellectual inquiry. It also aspires to the 'development of a performance culture', with a focus on the development of key performance indicators and targets. Among the KPIs suggested are the University of Sydney's 'teaching performance indicators' (which are used for strategic internal allocation of funds); an increase in the number of staff with qualifications in teaching in HE; and the development of indicators of individual teaching quality. One of the seven priorities identified within the Plan is to 'recognise and reward teaching excellence'.

Professor Judyth Sachs, who was Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) at the University of Sydney until December 2006, is leading (with Denise Chalmers) a major project funded by the Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education: 'Rewarding and recognising quality teaching in higher education through systematic implementation of indicators and metrics in teaching and teacher effectiveness'. The project will last 3-4 years. Further information can be found at: www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick.go

The University of Sydney expects academic staff on teaching and research contracts to demonstrate high levels of achievement in both teaching and research within probation and promotion procedures. Staff performance in each of three categories (teaching, research and service) is evaluated. The University has three standards for evaluation related to promotion: satisfactory, superior and outstanding. For all promotions, contribution under the heading of 'service' must be judged to be at least 'superior'. For staff on teaching and research contracts promotion up to senior lecturer level requires an individual to be rated at least 'superior' in teaching and in research, and in addition to be rated 'outstanding' in at least one of these categories. Promotion above senior lecturer level requires an individual to be judged



outstanding in both research and teaching. Detailed information about time spent in teaching is gathered as part of the promotions process, which also asks for information about the average time dedicated to teaching by staff within the relevant academic unit.

The strategic importance of this approach to academic promotions was underlined by senior staff, and the project team was informed that promotions had been denied to outstanding researchers who were not able to evidence a claim for outstanding contribution to teaching. However, the project team did also encounter a degree of scepticism about the rigour with which cases for 'outstanding' contribution to teaching were likely to be scrutinised during the promotions process. The view that it was research contribution that 'really mattered' in the promotions process appeared widespread, though it was not evidenced. There was also significant unease expressed about the weight given to evidence from student evaluations in arriving at judgements of overall teaching performance. The case was made that student satisfaction was not a particularly robust indicator of effective student learning, which should be the goal of high-quality university teaching.

The evaluation of the teaching element of an application for promotion at the University of Sydney is formally done based on a teaching portfolio. This consists of a statement of up to one thousand words covering the areas of: teaching performance; research-led teaching; student-focussed teaching; scholarship of teaching; and leadership of teaching. The statement is accompanied by a variety of forms of evidence including student feedback scores, awards for teaching and examples of course materials. The portfolio is assessed by a Local Promotions Committee and in the case of promotions to senior lecturer or above, also by a Central Promotions Committee. The membership of these committees does not necessarily include anyone with specific expertise in the assessment of teaching portfolios.



Training in teaching in higher education is provided by the Institute for Teaching and Learning and by the Faculty of Education and Social Work. This ranges from a three-day course in the principles and practice of university teaching and learning, to a Graduate Certificate in Educational Studies (Higher Education) and to Diploma and Masters programmes. The three-day course is compulsory for new staff. For all staff undertaking supervision for the first time at the University of Sydney, completion of the Development Program for Research Higher Degree Supervision is also compulsory.

The University of Sydney invests a proportion of its operating grant strategically to recognise high-quality teaching at Faculty level. Six per cent of its operating grant is distributed to faculties based on their relative teaching quality, which is determined using data from the Student Course Experience Questionnaire; data on retention and progression and data on graduate employment and further study. In addition, the university offers, through its 'scholarship index', financial rewards to departments whose staff members contribute to teaching quality as evidenced by completion of an accredited teaching qualification, receipt of an award for teaching, or dissemination of research on teaching. The university also offers a range of grants to individual staff for teaching enhancement.

The Vice-Chancellor's University Awards for teaching are given in recognition of: outstanding teaching; excellence in research higher degree supervision; and support of the student experience. The criteria for these awards closely mirror those of the Carrick Institute.

Student feedback is collected at two levels. Programme-level evaluations are conducted through the Student Course Experience Questionnaire (SCEQ) and the Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ). The University seeks to conduct systematic analyses of the 'free-text' comments generated by these evaluations as well as of the statistical data they generate. Module-level evaluations are collected through a Unit of Study Evaluation (USE) conducted at the end of each semester. Some academic departments also conduct their own detailed evaluations of modules, believing that USE measures students' perceptions of teaching more effectively than students' learning.

The *Learning and Teaching Plan 2007-2010* stresses the importance of aligning developments in teaching and learning with the successful achievement of agreed graduate attributes. One of the key aims of the plan is to 'embed graduate attributes in teaching and assessment practices'. Information from the SCEQ is to be used to monitor and evaluate the attainment of graduate attributes.

Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

In December 2006, while the project team were visiting Australia, the Ministry for Education, Science and Training announced the distribution of funding under the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund for 2007. The Learning and Teaching Performance Fund was created in 2003 as part of the Australian Government's 'Our Universities: Backing Australia's Future' initiative. Under this fund, AU\$83 million is distributed to the universities judged to have the best teaching performance. The quality of teaching and learning is judged on the basis of scores from the national Course Experience Questionnaire (completed by recent graduates from all Australian universities); data on employment or further study of recent graduates; and data on retention and progression. Twenty-one universities were recognised for excellence. Recognition was given under four broad disciplinary headings and in two bands. The University of Sydney was in the top band for 'humanities, art and education' and in the second band for 'business, law and economics'. It was not listed for science and engineering or for health. The performance of the university in this national judgement of the quality of teaching will be a significant factor in strategic future planning.

6.2. The University of Melbourne

Interviews were held at the University of Melbourne with Professor Richard James (Centre for the Study of Higher Education); Professor Leon Sterling (Professor of Computer Science); Associate Professor Marcia Devlin (Director of Teaching and Learning Unit, Faculty of Economics and Commerce); Dr Martin Davies (Senior Lecturer in Higher Education, Faculty of Economics and Commerce); Ms Elizabeth Baré (Vice-Principal (Human Resources)); Professor Peter McPhee (Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)); Ms Suzanne Daroesman (Manager, Evaluation Cycle) and Mr Bill Jones, (Planning Analyst, (Planning Office)).

Documents considered as part of the project were:

- The University of Melbourne: Teaching and Learning Management Plan 2005
- *Growing Esteem: The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan, 2006*
<http://growingesteem.unimelb.edu.au/>
- *The Melbourne Model: Report of the Curriculum Commission*
www.futurestudents.unimelb.edu.au/courses/melbmodel
- *Nine Principles Guiding Teaching and Learning in the University of Melbourne: the framework for a first-class teaching and learning environment.*
www.cshe.unimelb.edu.au/pdfs/9principles.pdf
- Gabrielle Baldwin, *The Teaching-Research Nexus*, Centre for the Study of Higher Education, 2005
- Programme for 'Preparing the Melbourne Graduate: outstanding students, outstanding teachers – the 2006 Vice-Chancellor's Colloquium on Teaching and Learning'
- The University of Melbourne Evaluation Cycle
www.upo.inimelb.edu.au/upo_EC_Home.html

- Quality of Teaching: Student Feedback Questionnaire
- *The University of Melbourne Personnel Policy and Procedures Manual*, section 17: Promotion
www.unimelb.edu.au/ppp/docs/17.html
- Martin Davies et al., 'Systematic Influences on Teaching Evaluations: The Case for Caution', *Australian Economics Papers* 46:1 (2007), 18-38.

Growing Esteem: The University of Melbourne Strategic Plan, 2006 articulates the University of Melbourne's aspiration to be one of the finest universities in the world. The university identifies its three key priorities as research, teaching and knowledge transfer: 'a tightly wrapped spiral of distinct but related activities that together define the institution's character', described in the plan as a 'triple helix'. Priorities related to teaching include the implementation of the 'Melbourne model' of curriculum reform, which will see a greatly reduced number of undergraduate programmes with a more liberal focus. The plan indicates that the university seeks to 'set a new standard in Australia' in relation to the student experience and also aspires to be the highest achieving of the 'group of eight' research-intensive universities in the national Learning and Teaching Performance Fund.



The University of Melbourne has recently extended its probationary period for academic staff from three to five years. It has also developed a new framework for appraisal of staff performance, known as the 'performance development framework'. The outcomes from the annual appraisal process are recorded centrally: this is a response to external requirements to link performance and reward schemes. Staff cannot apply for promotion unless their performance appraisal indicates 'good' performance in all aspects of their role. Promotion criteria require academic staff to demonstrate competence in teaching, research and 'service' and in addition for promotion up to senior lecturer level to demonstrate excellence in at least one of these areas. Promotion to professorial level requires 'sustained exceptional contribution to teaching'; however, the application process appears to give more weight to evidence of excellence in research output. Promotions criteria and processes are currently under discussion in relation to the realisation of the new strategic plan.

Teaching portfolios are used as part of the promotions process. These contain details of all teaching undertaken, and evidence from student evaluations. The promotions documentation observes that 'not all aspects of teaching performance can be objectively documented', and lays considerable weight on references from the Head of Department. Promotions panels do not necessarily have anyone with expertise in the evaluation of teaching portfolios on them.

The Centre for the Study of Higher Education (CSHE) at the University of Melbourne was set up in 1968 and has established a significant reputation both for research and for policy development. The CSHE offers accredited programmes in teaching in higher education, including a Graduate Certificate in University Teaching. This is not compulsory for new staff; indeed capacity issues mean that a limited number of staff are able to take this programme in any year. All staff are expected to participate in induction workshops covering aspects of teaching and learning and of research supervision.



Teaching awards are given at a number of levels, from departmental to institutional. Faculty Awards are known as Dean's Teaching Awards. These are awarded by a panel that considers data from student evaluations, reviews teaching materials, and looks for evidence of effective innovation. The CHSE won the tender to design the teaching awards given by the Carrick Institute, and the University of Melbourne uses these same criteria in its own institutional award scheme. Awards are given for teaching and support of learning and for research supervision: they are each worth AU\$25,000. The teaching award scheme refers closely to the *Nine Principles Guiding Teaching and Learning in the University of Melbourne: the framework for a first-class teaching and learning environment*. Application for awards contains a substantial teaching portfolio, which must include information from module-level student evaluations in all courses taught over the past two years. The panel judging the teaching awards consists of senior academics, the Director of the CSHE, previous award winners, and students.

The University of Melbourne has a 'Performance Bonus' scheme, which uses information from annual appraisal to identify who should be awarded a bonus. This bonus could be used to reward exceptional performance in teaching or the support of student learning.

All undergraduate and postgraduate modules are evaluated by students at the end of each semester. Module evaluation is run at

departmental level. Results are then collated centrally by Student Administration and subsequently analysed by the University Planning Office. A detailed report of scores and trends is published every semester. Students are told at the beginning of each new module the scores received in the module when previously taught and any actions taken because of these. Data from module evaluations is used to drive resource allocations decisions. This detailed scrutiny of student evaluations has been conducted at the university for more than ten years, and it was observed that during this period the number of courses described by students as 'poorly taught' had declined significantly.

Data from module evaluations was widely seen as a useful management tool. However, there was much greater uncertainty about its usefulness as an assessment of the quality of students' learning within any given module. Many staff also believed that the uncritical use of such data could work against more complex forms of reflection on effective approaches to teaching and to learning. Peer observation of teaching was seen by many as a more useful tool for such enhancement-led reflections.

The University of Melbourne has a detailed framework that describes the principles and values underpinning its approach to teaching and learning. These principles include an atmosphere of intellectual excitement; an intensive research culture permeating teaching and learning activities; explicit concern and support for the development

Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

of students as individuals, and clear learning cycles of experimentation, feedback and assessment. The University has also identified the 'attributes' it aspires to give to its graduates. These include intellectual capacities, skills, ethical values and personal capacities. Policies and procedures associated with teaching and learning refer closely to these principles and attributes, which appears to give coherence and an intellectual integrity to what might otherwise appear to be impersonal processes.

Judgements of excellence in teaching and learning as expressed in the allocation of the government's Learning and Teaching Performance Fund for 2007 indicate consistently high performance by the University of Melbourne. The university was in the top band for 'business, law and economics' and 'health'; and in the second band for 'humanities, art and education' and 'science, computing, engineering, architecture and agriculture'. At just under AU\$9million, the University of Melbourne's allocation under the fund was the largest of any Australian university.

6.3. Monash University

The main interview held at Monash University was with Professor Graham Webb (Pro Vice-Chancellor (Quality)).

Professor Shiach and Dr Ketteridge participated in the annual Vice-Chancellor's Showcase of Teaching Excellence (2006) held at the Caulfield campus. This event was opened by the Vice-Chancellor and President, Professor Richard Larkins. The presentation in the morning session was given by Professor Richard James (Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne). The afternoon keynote was given by Professor Keith Trigwell (Institute for Teaching and Learning, University of Sydney). In the panel session 'Teaching Excellence – What does it mean?' Professor Shiach, Dr Ketteridge, and Professor James were joined by Ms Angela Carbone, Faculty of Information Technology, Monash University.

Documents considered as part of this project:

- *Monash University Strategic Framework 2004-2008 – Excellence and Diversity* www.monash.edu.au/about/monash-directions/excellence.html
- Monash University Monash Directions 2025 Monash University's Statement of Purpose www.monash.edu.au/about/monash-directions/directions.html
- Monash University Guidelines – Academic Promotions 2007 <http://adm.monash.edu/sss/academic-promotion/guidelines/>
- Monash University Centre for Higher Education *Quality Evaluations and Surveys* www.adm.monash.edu/cheq/evaluations/index.html
- *Monash Student Evaluation of Units* www.adm.monash.edu/cheq/evaluations/unit-evaluations/
- *Monash University Teaching Support* (for staff) <http://calt.monash.edu.au/staff-teaching/index.html>
- Monash University *Performance Management at Monash* www.adm.monash.edu.au/staff-development/ws/pms/

Monash University has eight campuses, with six in Australia, one in Malaysia and one in South Africa, and there are centres in London and Prato, Italy. The University has more than 50,000 students from over 130 countries and over 6,000 full-time staff. Monash has a strong tradition in providing excellence in education and a growing international reputation for its research. It is one of the Group of Eight universities, which are Australia's leading research-intensive institutions. In 2006, the University received confirmation that it had received a second allocation (of A\$4.591 million) from the national Learning and Teaching Performance Fund. This success places Monash in the second grouping of Australian universities

which demonstrate 'high achievement in teaching and learning' and not in the premier table of universities which demonstrate 'excellence in teaching and learning'.

The *Strategic Framework (2004-2008)* sets out the aspiration to establish Monash as a leading international university recognised for its excellence in research and scholarship by 2008. The Framework states: "Recent data relating to both research performance and evaluation of teaching suggests that in relative terms Monash is stable rather than improving compared to other leading Australian universities. A major new effort is required if Monash is to achieve its potential to become not only a leading Australian university but also a truly great international university."

In setting out the University's strategic aims for excellence in education, the Framework recognises the importance of:

- attracting high quality staff and students
- determining a University view on the 'nexus' between teaching and research
- assisting staff and students to achieve their full potential through staff development and student leadership programmes
- maintaining and further developing an environment where staff are valued for their contributions to teaching and learning.



In meeting the research and education aims, the Framework notes the need for support through excellent management. For Monash, because of its size complexity and international working, this presents 'significant management challenges'.

This last point became visible to us during our visit to the Caulfield campus and talking to academic staff from different disciplines in the University. The view expressed by staff is that Monash is seeking to position itself as a research-led university and to this end going through some change management, including staff re-profiling in some areas to achieve a skills base that more fully fits the University mission.

Monash University has an institution-wide performance management system that applies to all academic staff on indefinite and fixed term contracts. It is seen as central to the articulation of clear performance measures to individual members of staff, so they know what to achieve; these include teaching and learning, and research outputs that can be tracked. The system is based on a simple appraisal or annual review process by which achievements and contributions over the past year can be reviewed and expectations for the year ahead set out. Staff development provision at Monash has been reviewed by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Quality) and a system implemented in which support is tightly focused on improvement and enhancement of performance. Details of the Monash approach to performance management are readily obtainable from the documents listed above. It is noteworthy that information from the University student unit evaluations will be expected to form part of the performance measures reviewed during the performance management discussions. In terms of developing its managers, Monash has implemented an ambitious programme of 360-degree appraisals across the top 300 or so of its managers and leaders in the university and it is intended that these will take place regularly at one to two year intervals. From these appropriate action plans will identify routes for personal development.



Faced with the challenge of managing quality and assuring a standard student learning experience across all its campuses in Australia, in Malaysia and South Africa, Monash has developed robust quantitative systems for student evaluation of units (modules) and for teaching performance.

The website (for details, see above) on unit evaluation contains central university information available to the public on Monash unit evaluations since 1993 and gives details of the scope of the questions asked. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Quality) reported to us that the University undertakes about 1,400 unit evaluations per semester with an average response rate of about 40 per cent. To complement this, the Monash Questionnaire series on Teaching (MonQueST) is a set of 11 questionnaires focussed on different teaching activities (for example lecturing), for details see above under the Centre for Higher Education Quality. This information is the property of the individual member of staff and is intended to provide student feedback on teaching for the benefit of academic staff and may be used as part of a portfolio on personal teaching information

Further details of how the various strands of evaluative information have been linked together to provide a more useful tool for quality management in the University and relevant to the requirements of the Australian Learning and Teaching

Performance Fund can be found at: www.its.monash.edu.au/staff/projects/unit-eval/

For academic staff there is a probation period of three years, extendible to five years. A Graduate Certificate in Higher Education or comparable qualification is normally required by academic staff and is offered by Monash University to probationers. It is at Masters level and is equivalent roughly to half a year full time study.

There are career routes for promotion to Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Reader, Associate Professor and Professor and the University has excellent documentation setting out the various guidelines for members of staff, as well as Guidelines for Promotions Committees. Teaching portfolios are not used for such promotions purposes.

To make a case for promotion, staff have to identify their academic achievements in research, education and service. Applicants need to satisfy the relevant Dean that both criteria for promotion have been met, that is [1] sustained high performance at the current level of appointment and [2] the capacity to perform satisfactorily at the next level. The distinctive feature of the Monash system is that candidates are able to allocate a relative weighting to each of the three areas of performance. The total weightings must add up to 100 per cent,

Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

the minimum weighting allowed for each of research and education is 30 per cent and the minimum weighting for service is 10 per cent. The weightings are meant to reflect quality and impact of achievement in particular areas rather than time spent. The University advises great care by candidates in making decisions on the balance of weightings in their applications and suggests that they take advice from a more senior colleague in determining the proportions. The amount or quality of supporting evidence should reflect the weighting declared in their applications. The supporting material for an application to Senior Lecturer/Reader and above must include a Head of Unit report and Performance Management Supervisor's report. A summary of unit evaluations should be present and a summary of teaching evaluations (MonQueST), as well as the other usual type of evidence relating to research achievements, research supervision, research funding, etc. (for details, see Academic Promotions information above).

In the current guidelines, there is an interesting special case for promotion based on outstanding leadership and this will apply for three years only. For this type of application, the weightings required are 60 per cent for service (with significant emphasis on leadership within the faculty or the University) and 40 per cent for research and education, with a minimum of 10 per cent for each.

By using the weighting system, it is possible for staff to progress to Associate Professor based on excellent achievement and contribution in education and satisfy all other criteria. The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Quality) informed us that it is also possible to be promoted to Professor for excellence in teaching and supporting learning, although few cases had been successfully made on this basis. From our discussions with the range of academic staff at Monash we were able to meet, there was a feeling that research was the most significant factor in determining promotion.

6.4. The University of Western Australia

Interviews were held at the University of Western Australia with:

Dr Allan Goody, Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning; Dr Lee Partridge, Lecturer in Higher Education; Ms Caroline Bulsara, Lecturer in Higher Education

Professor Brendan Waddell, Head of School of Anatomy and Human Biology and Chair of Promotions and Tenure Committee; Mrs Elizabeth Hutchinson, Executive Officer, Promotions and Tenure Committee, HR

Ms Eileen Thompson, Instructional Design/Lecturer, UWA Business School; Associate Professor Jackie Johnson, UWA Business School

Ms Sandra Carr, Senior Lecturer in Medical Education and Director of Postgraduate Studies, Education Centre, Faculty of Medicine, Dentistry and health Studies;

Professor Jane Long, Acting Deputy Vice-Chancellor; Mrs Sue Smurthwaite, Executive Officer, Teaching and Learning Policy Unit.

Documents considered as part of this project were:

- The University of Western Australia: *Strategic Directions*, undated
[http://registrar.uwa.edu.au/__data/page/65557/Strategic-Directions06.pdf#search=per cent22strategic per cent20directions per cent22](http://registrar.uwa.edu.au/__data/page/65557/Strategic-Directions06.pdf#search=per%20strategic%20directions%20per%20cent22)
- The University of Western Australia: *Strategic Plan: Achieving International Excellence*, April 2007
www.registrar.uwa.edu.au/__data/page/65557/Strat-Plan-2007.pdf
- The University of Western Australia: *Teaching and Learning Strategy: 2006-2008*
www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/tl4/for_uwa_staff/policies/planning_and_management/management_plan?f=154982

- The University of Western Australia: *Teaching and Learning: Survey Instruments*
www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/tl4/teaching_and_learning_-_uwa/survey_instruments
- The University of Western Australia: *Teaching and Learning Indicators (An Analysis of Graduate Destination Survey/Course Experience Questionnaire Results and Related Student Statistics)* 2006 Statistics Office, Planning Services
www.planserv.uwa.edu.au/eis/reports#TL
- The University of Western Australia: *Human Resources, Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff*
www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policy/toc/promotion_and_tenure_of_academic_staff
- The University of Western Australia: *Human Resources, Performance Management of Staff*
www.hr.uwa.edu.au/policy/toc/performance_management_of_staff
- The University of Western Australia: Centre for the Advancement of University Teaching – Teaching and Learning Policy Unit: *Teaching Awards*
www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/tl4/or_uwa_staff/prizes_and_awards



In the context of higher education in Australia, the University of Western Australia (UWA) is a medium-sized university with just under 18,000 students in 2006. There are about 3,000 FTE staff (1,266 academic staff). The mission of the university is: "To advance, transmit and sustain knowledge and understanding through the conduct of teaching, research and scholarship at the highest international standards for the benefit of the Western Australian, Australian and international communities." It is a research-intensive university and one of the Group of Eight with a strong teaching and research nexus across all disciplines.

High quality is top of the UWA list of 'Defining Characteristics' and quality features strongly in the UWA Strategic Plan. The commitment to high quality drives the recruitment, retention and development of staff, the selection of students, the provision of equipment and facilities, the practice of teaching, the conduct of research, the projection of the University in the community and the commitment to continuous improvement. The strategic plan states 'of all these, the recruitment, retention and development of high quality staff has been identified as the single most important strategic objective for the University in the immediate future'.

A distinctive feature of UWA is its strength in research. The University claims that it has a 'high proportion' of masters and research students across all its disciplinary areas. Staff have been highly successful in winning competitive research grants. On these indices, the University is consistently ranked in the top three or four Australian universities and it has set itself the strategic goal of maintaining and improving on that position.

The University has a Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) led by Dr Allan Goody with the mission of supporting teachers in their practice with the aim of enhancing the learning experience and quality of the teacher's experience at UWA.

This support is provided within a framework of principles that guide teaching and learning activities at The University of Western Australia, including:

- Creating an environment for staff and students which emphasises students and staff as partners in learning,
- Ensuring that teaching and learning take place in a culture of research and scholarship,
- Providing a 'high tech, high touch' educational experience which incorporates both effective classroom-based learning and the use of relevant educational technologies, to best meet the needs of a diverse student body,
- Actively improving the quality of the student learning experience within and beyond the classroom.

The various national student surveys that the University engages with are managed by UWA Planning Services and the statistics are freely available from the university web pages and as a University publication.

UWA has probation schemes for its staff and in the case of academic staff, the period of probation is for three or five years according to the level of the appointment. For academic staff who teach, there is no mandatory Graduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching required as part of that probation as is the case in some other Australian universities.

UWA has a scheme for managing the performance of its entire staff and this is called the Professional Development Review (PDR). All staff other than casual staff are reviewed annually and the objectives of the scheme are to:

- Review the past year's performance,
- Recognise the achievements of the reviewees,
- Clarify any changes to the reviewees' role,
- Plan for the coming year and identify goals,
- Equip individuals to meet the immediate and future challenges of their position,
- Assist individuals to achieve their goals and those of the School/Unit and the University, and:
- Provide guidance on career development.

The University states that 'Central to the PDR is an expectation that staff will reflect on the functional areas in which they have responsibilities. These will include one or more of the following: teaching and learning, research and scholarship, leadership, management, service to the university, administration, client service, projects, professional services, University support services (for example trades, gardening, cleaning) and other'.



Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

It is noted that under the June 2005 provision, UWA states that any salary increment due to a member of staff with an identified performance problem will not be paid until the performance has reached a satisfactory level. It would seem that this system could be activated in the case of poor performance in teaching.

Full details of the operation of the PDR can be found in the UWA HR web pages referred to above.

An element of good practice at UWA is the central role of an Academic Portfolio. Full details of this can be found on the UWA HR web pages under Promotion and Tenure of Academic Staff (see above).

This document is required by academic staff for supporting an application for tenure or promotion. It is an integral part of the PDR for academic staff and is used for supporting an application for study leave. In this way, it is a dynamic document that is not just put in good order at critical points in an academic career pathway, but is updated regularly for annual review purposes. There are precise UWA guidelines for the construction of the UWA Academic Portfolio, including the requirement for a summary statement on teaching and learning, research and scholarship and service, and covering no more than five pages. In the case of an Academic Portfolio for promotion involving excellence in teaching and learning, it would be expected that the portfolio contained quantitative evidence from unit level evaluations of teaching and details of



measures of esteem as a teacher, such as University or national teaching prizes (for details of these see the CATL-UWA Teaching and Learning Policy Unit web pages above). It is noteworthy that UWA has not developed a University-wide observation of teaching scheme and the use of evidence of this type would be limited to a small number of individuals.

UWA has full and transparent criteria for promotion of teaching and research staff to Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor, Professor and Professorial Fellow (Research) or Professorial Fellow (Teaching). Details can be found on the UWA HR web pages above. The general criteria fall under three headings:

1 Teaching and Learning

- Demonstrated excellence in teaching and learning
- Demonstrated excellence in leadership in teaching and learning
- Commitment to high quality education.

2 Research, Scholarship and Original Achievement and/or Other Relevant Creative Work

- Demonstrated excellence in research achievement
- Demonstrated leadership in research
- Commitment to quality with an international focus.

3 Service

- Demonstrated contribution to the development of collegial work environment
- Demonstrated professional leadership within the University
- Contribution to community leadership.

These criteria are articulated in further detail for promotion to the different levels.

In our discussions with senior UWA staff, it is clear that a case for promotion to senior lecturer can be based on exceptional contribution in teaching and learning, or research and scholarship, or a significant contribution to both teaching and research.

However, it is not possible to get promotion to full Professor on teaching alone, as the complete criteria cannot be met. For full professor, applicants must meet all three criteria for teaching, research and service. UWA recognises that as the University grows in size and the national Research Quality Assessment is introduced, there may be a need to consider academic posts that have a predominately teaching bias (alongside some academic posts which could have a very minimal teaching requirement). For these sorts of reasons, the University introduced the posts of Professorial Fellow (Research) in 2004 and Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning) in 2002/3. In the case of Professorial Fellow (Teaching and Learning), there is a requirement for a leadership role in teaching and learning, including postgraduate supervision, and individuals are expected to have demonstrated scholarly achievement and be recognised internationally for their work. In making such a case, applicants in their Academic Portfolio must have demonstrated indicators of esteem, such as university or faculty prizes for teaching, and strong evidence of student satisfaction in UWA unit level evaluations of their teaching (SPOT – Student Perceptions of Teaching and/or SURF – Students’ Unit Reflective Feedback). Details of these survey instruments can be found on the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning web pages above. The use of these evaluation tools by academic staff is not mandatory at UWA as in some other Australian universities.

In our discussions with academic staff in Schools at UWA, there was a feeling that there is no parity of esteem between teaching and research and that it is research that really matters in the promotion stakes. This view is not that held by the most senior academic staff in the University. Staff also expressed reservations about the value of the SPOT questionnaire. One member of staff told us that ‘if students don’t like you, you’re lost’ and it was also noted in one School that staff receiving evaluative evidence through SPOT did need a mentor to help them make sense of the data.

6.5. Lund University and Göteborg University

6.5.1. Student satisfaction and overall teaching quality

Student satisfaction is measured in a number of ways in Sweden. Firstly, individual institutions carry out student evaluations in various ways, primarily using the 'traditional' end of course unit questionnaire, which is processed internally. In addition the government carried out a nationwide survey of over 11,000 students in 2006 called 'A Mirror for Students', which asked students about their experiences and perceptions of higher education in Sweden. Results of this survey are only available in Swedish at present, although it is clear from the results that the interest is more in overall perceptions than in the performance of individual institutions, with these being presented as a table at the end of the report.

Despite the collection of this data, there is not the same emphasis put on student evaluation of course or institutions as there is in Australia and the UK. Students are involved in the appointment of staff, particularly with external professorships (i.e. chairs which are advertised, rather than to which staff are promoted) with student representatives

sitting on academic appointment committees. Student views are taken very seriously, with active student representation existing on committees at all levels of the institutions.

From discussions with staff in Sweden, it is clear that the focus of teaching quality is very much on the overall quality of teaching, and not focussed as much on promoting individual excellence. One institution has 'Vice Chancellor's Advisors on Quality', whose role it is, in part, to improve and maintain teaching quality across the institution. Also, quality is devolved to individual faculties to manage, with these reporting to central boards.

The collegial approach to quality is prevalent in Swedish institutions, with quality not being seen as an enemy of academic progress or freedom. Staff take part in faculty audits and there is a culture of sharing and disseminating teaching quality initiatives and curriculum and pedagogic developments.

6.5.2. Individual teaching excellence

Both institutions rarely discussed teaching excellence as such. One has a 'pedagogical academy' in one of its faculties, where staff can put together a portfolio to show how they support high quality learning, which is then judged by staff from the faculty and from the

educational development department. Successful applicants to the academy receive an increase in salary, and can be used as mentors for more junior staff and for staff who themselves wish to apply for membership of the academy.

Because of the way that promotion procedures work in Sweden (see below), teaching quality is maintained at a coherent, general level. There appears to be little incentive for staff to 'stand out' as excellent teachers, except for personal motivational reasons.

6.5.3. Career progression and teaching

Swedish career progression in HE is largely determined through governmental regulations and guidelines, and in one institution it was clear that promotion was primarily linked to research output and standing.

This is particularly true for those wishing to apply for external professorships, who are required to bring a set proportion of their salary through externally funded research.

6.5.4. Teaching Awards

There are no national teaching awards in Sweden. Both institutions had internal awards. In one case, these did not seem to be awarded in a transparent fashion, with recipients being informed that they had won without them knowing that they had been nominated or selected for inclusion in the awards scheme. These awards carried a financial award, but were not disseminated through the institution in any meaningful way.

In the other institution, pedagogical awards are given to individuals and teams annually, with a clear set of criteria for awards, and a committee that was responsible for judging them. These awards are seen as being important more for the prestige which winning gives, although there is a monetary prize as well. These are disseminated through the institution, and seminars are organised for award winners to disseminate their work more widely in the institution.



Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

6.6. The University of Aberdeen

Interviews were held at the University of Aberdeen with Catherine Macaslan, Vice-Principal (Learning and teaching) and with Joy Wootten, Management Development Adviser, HR.

Documents considered as part of the project were:

- University of Aberdeen *Strategic Plan 2007-10*
www.abdn.ac.uk/admin/ppg/plan.shtml
- University of Aberdeen *Framework for Learning and Teaching*
- *Procedures for Managing Promotion and Recognising Contribution: Academic, Academic Related and Professional Staff*
www.abdn.ac.uk/hr/promotion07/academic/
- Career development and Staff Appraisal Scheme: Teaching and Research Staff
- *Procedures on Probation.*

The University's *Strategic Plan 2007-10*, identifies one of its key objectives as becoming 'a world leader in learning and teaching'. Key priorities for learning and teaching within the *Strategic Plan* include ensuring that students can benefit from a research-driven learning experience, improving student retention and student engagement; and undertaking a substantial curriculum review to meet the challenges of the twenty-first century.

The University has adopted the Joint Negotiating Committee for Higher Education Staff (JNCHES) *Academic Role Profiles* to inform discussions of teaching contribution during probation and promotion processes. The profiles were agreed at a national level in 2005. They indicate the contribution to teaching and learning that can reasonably be expected of staff employed on teaching/research or teaching/scholarship contracts at different levels within a higher education institution.



In achieving grades of senior lecturer or above national/international impact and recognition is expected. This impact is expected of research and of teaching. Promotion to professorial level based on excellence in teaching is possible. It would be expected that staff so promoted would be making a substantial contribution to the scholarship of teaching. It was argued that scholarship of teaching should demonstrate a capacity for articulating abstract ideas, testing arguments, and externalising outcomes that would show 'connectedness with the research ethos' of the University.

Teaching portfolios are not used by the University as evidence of contribution by individual members of staff. It was felt that portfolios were very difficult to evaluate robustly. This was firstly because claims within them could not always be evidenced, and secondly because promotions or appointments panels did not often have the requisite expertise to judge such portfolios.

The University offers a wide range of courses and workshops to support teaching and learning, offered through the Centre for Learning and Teaching. Newly appointed academic staff are not required to undertake an accredited teaching qualification. All staff

with 'teaching' as part of their contract are expected to make a significant and high quality contribution to teaching and learning.

The identification of criteria for the recognition of excellence in teaching has been the subject of extensive debate and discussion in recent years within the University. The University's appraisal scheme does not allow appraisal documentation to be used to inform judgements about performance. Peer observation of teaching, although undertaken to support the development of staff, is also not used to inform judgements about the contribution or performance of individual members of staff.

The University does not have a scheme of prizes for teaching. One College within the University, the College of Arts and Social Sciences, introduced Teaching Awards for the first time in 2006/07. Members of staff are nominated for these awards by students. These nominations had to be supported by the relevant Head of School, and all those nominated are invited to make a presentation on their teaching.

The University has contribution points on its new pay scale. Line managers put individuals forward for these contribution points. In

relation to teaching, evidence available to line-managers about teaching performance may rely heavily on student feedback, though it is also likely to include feedback from external examiners. The process of evaluating applications for contribution pay based on excellence in teaching is still being developed.

Work on reform of the curriculum at the University of Aberdeen will be informed by work undertaken at the University of Melbourne on the development of the 'Melbourne Model'. The Melbourne approach of articulating desired graduate attributes and identifying the key principles underpinning teaching were felt to be a potentially useful part of this curriculum review.

The University of Aberdeen does not participate in the National Student Survey, so data on student satisfaction cannot be benchmarked against overall NSS scores.

6.7. The University of Bath

Interviews were held at the University of Bath with Professor Ian Jamieson (Pro-Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching) and Ms Gwen van der Velden (Director of Learning and Teaching Enhancement), and Dr Simon Inger (Academic Development Officer).

Documents considered as part of this project were:

- University of Bath *Academic Career Progression: Principles and Framework* (a working paper considered by the Academic Assembly in May 2008)
- University of Bath *Learning and Teaching Strategy 2006-07 to 2007-08* (November 2006)
- University of Bath *Corporate Plan 2006/07 to 2008/09*
www.bath.ac.uk/vc/coredocs/corporateplan.htm
- University of Bath *Background Information for Prospective Lay Members of Council*
www.bath.ac.uk/universitysecretary/policy-advice/Backgroundpercent20Information.htm
- University of Bath Learning and Teaching Committee
www.bath.ac.uk/learningandteaching/committees/learningandteaching/
- University of Bath Teaching Awards for Staff
www.bath.ac.uk/awards/staff

The University of Bath *Corporate Plan*, approved by the University Council in July 2006, states amongst its long term aims that

the University aims: "To deliver flexible, high quality teaching and professional education that is student centred and accessible, offering equality of opportunity to anyone with the ability to benefit and to attract and retain high quality staff through appropriate recognition, development and promotion opportunities and effective leadership." The mission of the University distinctively emphasises the education of professional practitioners and cites high quality research and high quality teaching being mutually sustaining as a basis for academic excellence. In supporting the implementation of the Corporate Plan there is acknowledgment of the requirement to develop an approach for nurturing leadership skills at all management levels.

The Learning and Teaching Committee, which is responsible to Senate, is responsible for the development of the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, with delivery of performance measures essentially devolved to departments.

In furtherance of its strategic aim to attract and retain high quality staff, Professor Ian Jamieson (Pro-Vice-Chancellor Learning and Teaching) has led a major university review of promotions and similar career development procedures. A new document entitled *Academic Career Progression: Principles and Framework* (May 2007), has been considered by the Academic Assembly, but not yet finally approved.

The Academic Career Progression document reviews and reforms the procedures for probation of academic staff newly appointed as lecturers, the promotion of academic staff and the promotion Teaching Fellows and Research Fellows. The University has created posts with titles of Professorial Research Fellows and Professorial Teaching Fellows and regards them as being broadly equivalent in esteem and contribution to the University.

The University has established criteria covering [1] Management and Leadership,



Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

[2] Research and Scholarship and [3] Teaching, and applicants for promotion need to provide evidence to demonstrate how they meet the criteria in different combinations for different career routes. For example, as in other UK universities, for promotion to Senior Lecturer candidates are expected to have made major contributions in two of the three categories, with an effective contribution in the third.

There is no formal requirement for a teaching portfolio as part of the submission and candidates are required to describe the full range of their teaching in terms of the types of courses, students, and teaching methods. Evidence is required at every level and must include firstly student feedback using the standard Bath unit feedback format, showing

sustained performance, and secondly testimonials concerning teaching effectiveness from senior colleagues who have scrutinised their course documentation, observed the candidates' teaching on more than one occasion and moderated their assessment practices and standards.

There are two points to note here. Firstly, the University has developed an online student unit evaluation system, the data from which is owned by departments. The scheme is due to be rolled out across the University for the beginning of the 2007-08 session. So far, this has achieved response rates of about 63 per cent. Staff performance in the Bath online evaluation seems to become a key success factor in promotion procedures. Secondly, observation of teaching at Bath

is used in a developmental way, with a University requirement that each member or academic staff is observed at least once every three years, but can be done more often.

Supplementary material in applications may include external examiner comments, completion rates and evidence of successful CPD. These requirements seem to be articulated predominantly in terms of undergraduate and taught masters teaching and do not identify any specific aspects related to research supervision that is surprising bearing in mind the University mission.

What is interesting in the emerging procedures at the University of Bath is the identification of career routes to Professorial Research or Teaching Fellow, making it possible to be promoted to a senior grade, primarily on the basis of excellence in teaching. For Professorial Teaching Fellows, applicants provide evidence of teaching as a major contribution and one area from Management and Leadership and Research and Scholarship (or both) where their contribution could be described as effective, but not major. (For promotion to Professor, the contribution to Research and Scholarship would be major, with one or both of the other two being effective). However, in the current documentation, it is not possible to be awarded the title of Professor (as opposed to Professorial Teaching Fellow) based on excellence in teaching with effective contribution in the other two elements.

As in other universities, Bath has schemes to recognise, encourage and acknowledge excellence in teaching. There is an Innovation in Learning and Teaching Award, which recognises significant contribution to innovation in curriculum design, content or delivery. The Mary Tasker Award is open to all members of academic staff and recognises excellence in teaching in the University. The criteria for excellence are not specific and applicants (about 15 per year) require evidence to support a claim, together with student and staff feedback, and a testimonial from the head of department. They are judged by a small panel chaired by the PVC



Learning and Teaching, Vice-President Education from the Students' Union and past winners of University Teaching Awards. The successful nominee receives a one-off cash prize of £500 and their department £1,500 to be spent at the discretion of the successful nominee. The John Willis Award, with the same financial rewards, recognises dedication to the academic and personal lives of students combined with a significant contribution to teaching and research. It is intended for less senior academic staff, in post for ten or fewer years.

The University participates in the National Student Survey (NSS) and data is monitored by the Learning and Teaching Committee. As part of the commitment to high quality teaching, the Corporate Plan includes a commitment to identify principles to guide the development of an institutional Student Experience Strategy. Bath has achieved some real success in the NSS. In the 2006 National Student Survey, the quality of teaching at Bath achieved an overall score of 3.9 out of 5. The final response rate by final year undergraduates to the National Student Survey 2007 is a remarkable 73.39 per cent, an increase of approximately 10 per cent from NSS 2006. It is to be noted that the overall sector response rate was 59.16 per cent. At Bath, the Students' Union has been instrumental in promoting the NSS 2007 to achieve such response rates.

6.8. University College London

Interviews were held at University College London (UCL) with Professor Michael Worton (Vice-Provost Academic and International), Mr Bob Allan (Senior Tutor), Professor David Bogle (Head of the Graduate School), Ms Sarah Brant (Director of Human Resources), and Miss Brigitte Picot (Director of the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching).

UCL has recently revisited the ways in which it recognises and rewards excellence in all areas of academic life. Teaching excellence and innovation were included as criteria for promotion up to full Professor level. UCL does



not distinguish between professors who have been promoted through different routes.

The College's Research Strategy Committee considered a paper on excellence in research, and the expectations that the College had of colleagues with regard to high quality research. This was discussed by UCL's Academic Board. At UCL, the Academic Board is the major consultative committee for the College in academic matters. All professors in the College are automatically members, as are some staff who have not become professors. In theory, the Board has over 700 members, but usually fewer than 100 attend. However, it does have a major impact on strategic development. When the Academic Board discussed the paper on excellence in research, it was agreed that it was not enough to concentrate on research alone, and that teaching, administration and enabling learning should be included in a revised and expanded paper.

The revised paper outlined what UCL expected of its staff in five areas: Administration, Enabling Learning, Knowledge Transfer, Research and Teaching. In return, the paper set out what standard of support staff can expect from the College (in terms of resources, rooms, training and development, etc.).



Research Reports On Participating Higher Education Institutions (cont)

In tandem with these developments, the College has developed a career path for teaching fellows. UCL has a number of staff who have been appointed to teaching only roles, and it was felt that it was necessary and important, if teaching was to be seen to be valued by the College, that these staff should have a career progression along the lines of that which already existed for the traditional lecturer role. The Teaching Fellow path runs through to Principal Teaching Fellow (PTF), and after that a member of staff could apply for a full Professorship, since there is an expectation that a PTF would be publishing in the relevant pedagogic literature for their discipline.

UCL has withdrawn from the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS). This was done as the College decided it would rather put effort into raising the wider profile of teaching excellence throughout UCL, rather than concentrate efforts on one or two individuals per year. To this end, UCL revised its existing Faculty Teaching Awards, and replaced them with the Provost's Teaching Awards, the first of which were awarded in July 2007. These Awards aim to highlight UCL's pedagogic expertise and leadership, and to demonstrate the college's commitment to continuous innovation in the

teaching it offers its students. There are clear criteria for the awards:

- contribution to curriculum innovation and development
- contribution to the wider student experience, such as the skills or internationalisation agendas
- contribution to UCL's strategic commitment to educate for 'global citizenship', social responsibility, leadership
- engagement in the development of interdisciplinary programmes
- innovation in support for learning
- development of the use of new technologies in teaching and learning. (from www.ucl.ac.uk/news/newsarticles/0707/07071301)

The College awards 10 Provost's Teaching Awards each year, and they are presented at a special ceremony for winners.

The College has recently also embarked on a process for surveying all its students, using the Barometer survey, which is conducted across a number of institutions. This is much more detailed than the National Student Survey (NSS), and was originally only used



for international students, but is now being used for home students as well. The College is still part of the NSS, but finds that it does not give results at a sufficiently detailed level for the College to act on any findings in a specific way.

The College offers training in teaching skills to all new staff, and has a policy that everyone who teaches students must have undertaken at least some basic training and development in teaching. This even applies to experts who are brought in to teaching in their own disciplines. Probationary members of staff who teach are required to undertake the Postgraduate Certificate in Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, although there seems to be some difficulties in the reporting line between the HR department and the Centre for the Advancement of Learning and Teaching in keeping records as to who has completed the course.



Conclusions

The project has uncovered significant and interesting shared approaches to the identifications and support of excellent teaching across the nine institutions that participated in the research, and has established that the challenges of enhancing teaching and learning in research-intensive universities have much in common internationally. Clearly, local contexts determine the degree of priority that is given to the enhancement of teaching and shape the detail of reward and enhancement approaches. However, the project has identified some key themes and approaches of particular relevance to the continuing enhancement of teaching at Queen Mary.

7.1. Use of Student Satisfaction Data

Data about student satisfaction informs judgements about teaching quality in all the institutions that participated in this study. When such data was used to indicate the quality of the overall learning experience of students within a particular discipline, school or faculty, there appeared to be widespread belief in its utility. When such data was used to assess the contribution of individual members of academic staff the team found some scepticism about its robustness and anxiety about its equity. It was argued by various staff interviewed by the project team that in some cases highly effective learning could be accompanied by a degree of student dissatisfaction with the intellectual challenges they were facing or the disciplinary requirements to which they were asked to conform. Overall, the project team concluded that while high levels of student satisfaction were a positive indicator of collective and of individual excellence, lower levels of satisfaction within individual modules needed to be understood and analysed locally for their significance to be fully understood.

During the course of the project, the team reflected on the relative paucity of data on student satisfaction available to senior managers at Queen Mary. Module-level evaluations are currently 'owned' by

academic departments, and data from them is not reported consistently or in detail except during periodic reviews. There is no data currently collected at Queen Mary about students' overall satisfaction with their degree programme as a whole or with their experience across a given year. As a result of the systematic approaches to the collection of data about student satisfaction the team observed, the Fellowship holder brought forward a plan to implement centrally managed programme-level evaluation, and also to develop systematic ways of reporting the results of module-level evaluations. This plan was approved by the senior management team, the Quality Enhancement Committee and the Academic Board and will be implemented in 2007/08.

7.2. Excellent Teaching in Research-intensive Institutions

Creating and sustaining excellent teaching within research-intensive institutions is most effective when it is done with the rigour and the creativity associated by many academics with high quality research. The culture of teaching in a research-intensive university needs to be one of inquiry, of innovation, and of challenge. The project team was struck by the ways in which institutions that interrogated and articulated the values and the objectives of university teaching in ways that engaged the academic community seemed to be particularly successful in creating a culture of teaching excellence, in generating high levels of student satisfaction and in achieving excellent learning outcomes for students. The substantial work undertaken to agree and then to achieve with students the desired 'graduate attributes' of a given university appeared to the team to have been an effective device in a number of cases for developing a shared and ambitious teaching culture.

It is proposed to undertake a project to identify the attributes we desire to achieve for and with Queen Mary graduates during the academic year 2007/08 and subsequently to embed these attributes within learning and teaching strategies.

The University of Melbourne has a clearly articulated set of graduate attributes and an identified set of principles that underlie their approach to teaching. In addition, while the project team were visiting, the University was just about to implement a radical curriculum reform, known as 'The Melbourne Model'. The team was struck by the ways in which this radical reform had led to widespread engagement of academic staff in debates about the purposes and the nature of university teaching. As a result, and as part of the dissemination of this project's findings, Professor Peter McPhee, Deputy Vice-Chancellor of the University of Melbourne, has been invited to deliver the Queen Mary Annual Lecture on Teaching and Learning on 'The Melbourne Model'. Professor McPhee will deliver this lecture on 21 January 2008 and will conduct a master-class for academic leaders on 22 January 2008.

7.3. Promotion Opportunities of Staff with a Teaching Focus

Within UK higher education, the promotion routes open to staff with a teaching rather than a research focus have been a matter of very substantial debate in recent years. The team was thus surprised to discover that very few of the institutions participating in this project would promote to full professorial level a member of academic staff who did not make a substantial contribution to research. Some institutions had created a separate category of 'professorial teaching fellow', which could be accessed without evidence of research output of international calibre. Others had concentrated on ensuring that all academic staff contributed to the highest level both in teaching and in research: in such institutions, neither an exclusively research-focused nor an exclusively teaching-focused route to full professorial status was possible. The issue of 'parity' was commonly raised during the project team's interviews, though it was not always clear if this meant parity of financial reward or of institutional esteem. Overall, however, promotion schemes in research-intensive

universities showed an increasing recognition of the different forms of contribution by staff to the strategic aims of teaching, research and knowledge transfer, and were becoming more flexible in the ways they recognised and rewarded different career models.

7.4. 'Teaching Portfolios'

'Teaching portfolios' were used by a number of the participating institutions to provide evidence of individual teaching contribution. The advantage of these portfolios was seen to be that they allowed individual members of staff to identify their particular strengths and their individual approaches to teaching while also allowing relevant senior staff or university committees to compare and evaluate these. The project team did also find a significant degree of scepticism about the utility of such portfolios, for a number of reasons: they were seen as time-consuming in preparation, the material within them could not always be rigorously tested, their individuality made comparisons in practice very difficult, and finally the committees evaluating them often did not have the expertise to do so. The team concluded that the utility of teaching portfolios in contexts such as contribution reward schemes or promotion decisions needed to be the subject of further detailed review within Queen Mary.



7.5. Departmental and Institutional Culture

Departmental and institutional cultures are vitally important in enabling or constraining teaching excellence. So too are the academic and management structures within universities. The perfect balance between disciplinary autonomy and institutional imperatives will always depend on a wide range of factors. The team was struck, however, by the extent to which the transformation of the culture associated with teaching could be frustrated when this balance was palpably wrong.

7.6. 'Excellent University Teaching'

Excellent university teaching can take many forms. This project did not start with any fixed views about preferred pedagogical approaches, and was keen at all times to respect the diversity of teaching styles and methods used within different disciplines. As the project developed, however, evidence of the impact on students of teaching that encourages active learning and generates critical and creative thinking by students was significant. Such teaching tends to draw on the research questions and methodology of the discipline within which it takes place. Excellence in teaching is thus understood not as a matter of employing specific techniques or strategies but rather of enabling the best possible learning outcomes for all students.

7.7. Indicators of Teaching Performance

The main output of this research project is twenty-four indicators of teaching performance. (See Appendix A) These have been developed based on what the team believed to be the most rigorous and productive approaches to measuring teaching performance identified during institutional visits. There were, of course, other examples of very good practice, but these were not always transferable to the Queen Mary context. The indicators will now be the subject of further internal consultation. It is hoped that they will make a substantial contribution to the current development of the Queen Mary Performance Reward Scheme and to revision of the Annual Report on Teaching. The indicators will be reviewed in twelve months time, in order to ensure they do not disadvantage any specific staff groups. They could then potentially be used in the future to inform a range of contexts within Queen Mary where judgements of teaching excellence need to be made based on robust evidence.



Appendix A

Indicators of Teaching Performance

The twenty-four indicators below are derived from what the project team found to be the most robust, transparent and relevant data used in other universities, but were developed to recognise the particular management structure and culture of Queen Mary. The first twelve indicators address the factors that indicate teaching quality within a specific academic department. The second twelve indicators are designed to facilitate the identification of staff who are making an exceptional individual contribution to teaching and learning. The proposed 'ownership' of the data that generates these indicators varies. This variation is driven by the desire to generate robust data and to avoid duplications in measurement of or reporting of data. As part of the project, a range of staff within Queen Mary were consulted about the appropriateness of these indicators, including members of the Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee and of the project Advisory Group as well as a range of staff in various senior academic and central support roles. As part of the implementation of the project's findings, further detailed consultation will take place with a range of stakeholders. The indicators will also be formally evaluated within twelve months of implementation to ensure that they do not disadvantage any particular staff groups or disciplines. (See Appendix B)

Twelve indicators of teaching quality within an academic department

- 1 Student satisfaction as measured through programme-level evaluation scores, NSS scores and synoptic analysis of departmental module-level evaluations
- 2 Reports from QAA or from accrediting bodies on specific programmes
- 3 Judgements in External examiners' reports.
- 4 Record of successful and sustained programme innovation.
- 5 Retention and progression statistics (compared to benchmarks).

- 6 Completion rates for postgraduate research degrees.
- 7 Postgraduate Research Experience Survey data.
- 8 Destination of Leavers from Higher Education (DLHE) statistics.
- 9 Academic achievement in relation to entry qualifications of students.
- 10 Recommendations and commendations from Internal Review.
- 11 Number of appeals or complaints from students.
- 12 Number of staff who have succeeded in gaining:
 - accredited teaching qualifications.
 - funding for enhancements of teaching and learning.
 - prizes for teaching.
 - Nomination by students for Drapers' Award for Excellence in Teaching.
 - invitations to act as external examiners or external reviewers.
 - Fellowship of Higher Education Academy.

Twelve indicators of individual teaching excellence:

(The indicators below are designed to support a case by an individual member of staff for excellence in teaching and the support of learning. These indicators should be available for any committee or group required to make a judgement of teaching excellence)

National/International Indicators:

- 1 Award of national prize or Fellowship for teaching and/or support of learning.
- 2 Receipt of peer-reviewed funding for projects to develop and enhance teaching and learning and successful completion of such projects.
- 3 Demonstrable impact on teaching in the discipline nationally and/or internationally, for example through publication of high-quality scholarship on teaching, the production of high-impact text books, substantial contribution to Subject Centre or subject associations, or substantial participation in policy forums.
- 4 High-level appointment as external expert on teaching and learning.



Queen Mary Indicators:

- 1 Highest levels of satisfaction in student feedback across all teaching over previous three years.
- 2 Excellent feedback on quality of teaching and/or levels of student achievement from external examiners.
- 3 Success in gaining:
 - a. accredited teaching qualification.
 - b. funding for enhancements of teaching and learning.
 - c. Queen Mary prize or award for teaching.
- 4 Evidence of excellent and sustained leadership of teaching activities that demonstrably improves students' learning.
- 5 Evidence of significant contributions to development of policy and enhancement of practice in relation to teaching and learning at departmental, Faculty or College level.
- 6 Examples of significant personal contribution to innovations in teaching, curriculum design, and/or student support that enhance students' learning.
- 7 Evidence of teaching informed by the research culture of the discipline and/or by appropriate professional practice in a way that has a positive impact on students' learning.
- 8 Evidence of significant individual contribution to the achievement of QM graduate attributes*.



* Work to develop shared understanding of 'QM Graduate Attributes' will take place during the academic year 2007/08.

Appendix B

Implementation Plan

Action	By Whom	Timescale
Formulation of KPI document	Project team	August – September 2007
Agreement of KPIs by Principal's Steering Group for use at QM	Professor Morag Shiach	September 2007
Academic Deans and Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee (LTAC) to be consulted on KPIs	Via Project Team	September 2007
Discussion with Academic Secretariat and Planning Unit to ensure effective link between KPIs, and Annual Report on Teaching	Professor Morag Shiach	September 2007
Discussions with Human Resources to ensure links with new Contribution Reward Scheme at QM (being introduced from 2007/2008 for Academic staff for additional increments and bonus payments)	Professor Morag Shiach	September/October 2007
Discussion with Educational and Staff Development to explore possible future links with QM Performance Appraisal Scheme via Staff Policy Committee	Professor Morag Shiach Dr Steve Ketteridge Dr Fiona Stephen	October/November 2007
Discussions with Heads of Department /School/Institute to outline uses of KPIs	Professor Morag Shiach Project team	October – December 2007
Clear dissemination of information to all academic staff (see dissemination plan)	Project team	October – December 2007
Use of KPIs in Reward Scheme, Annual Report on Teaching etc.	All relevant managers in QM	April – July 2008
Evaluate 'fitness for purpose' of KPIs with stakeholders and assess any discriminatory impact on staff coming from different backgrounds, including disciplinary differences	Project team	Mid to Late 2008

Appendix C

Dissemination Plan

Action	By Whom	Timescale
Dissemination of project findings within QM via Teaching and Learning website	Leigh Ward	2007/2008
Dissemination of project findings and KPIs to participating HEIs	Project team	September/October 2007
Dissemination of project findings via Leadership Foundation (website)	Professor Morag Shiach Leadership Foundation	September/October 2007
Dissemination of project findings within QM via Faculty Boards (Education Board in SMD)	Project team	October 2007
Dissemination of project findings via Leadership Foundation Fellowship Dissemination Event	Professor Morag Shiach Leadership Foundation	November 2007
High-profile events to engage staff within Queen Mary and beyond in the potential impact of systematic and ambitious approaches to reviewing teaching culture and curriculum.	Professor Peter McPhee of the University of Melbourne to deliver the QM Annual Lecture on Teaching and Learning and also to run a Master-class on designing and implementing The Melbourne Model.	January 2008
Publication of project findings via SEDA	Project team	2008
Publication in relevant journals	Project team	2007/08
Dissemination of project findings within QM via Teaching and Learning bulletin	Project Team and Helen Garrett (ESD)	Next issue of TandL Bulletin

Notes





For further information contact:
Mr L Ward
Executive Officer, Teaching and Learning
Office of the Principal
Queen Mary, University of London
Mile End Road
London
E1 4NS
Tel: +44 (0)20 7882 7684
Fax: +44 (0)20 8981 2848
email: l.m.ward@qmul.ac.uk