Perspectives and principles on measuring teaching

Purpose
Academic promotion processes in Australia and the United Kingdom are, in principle, committed to recognising and valuing teaching activities. However, what constitutes evidence of teaching activity has in general not been well understood by promotion committees, nor has there been clarity on how to interpret and judge evidence in teaching-related applications.

The model set out in *Making Evidence Count* suggests a robust approach to evidence of teaching at different academic levels, using three perspectives:

- Scope of activity
- Source of evidence
- Sphere of influence

This model has been developed by the Promoting Teaching Project 2012-13. This project was led by two Australian universities (Tasmania and Wollongong) and two British universities (Leicester and Newcastle), with advice from 15 universities through an International Advisory Group.

The cornerstone of the project is that evidence of excellent teaching to support promotion decisions is available through peer review and measurable indicators.

In *Making Evidence Count*, the project has developed a set of perspectives and principles to assist universities in clearly articulating this evidence, while taking account of the changing nature of teaching in today’s increasingly complex higher education sector.

Other Promoting Teaching resources include:

- **Good Practice Framework** – Benchmarks 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12 relate to perspectives and principles in *Making Evidence Count* (see Appendix 2).
- **Guide to Institutional Benchmarking** – provides processes and templates for mapping a university’s current approach to evidence about teaching, and outlines steps for developing a next generation approach based on the model presented in *Making Evidence Count*.

Figure 1: Promoting teaching – three perspectives on teaching evidence
Perspectives on evidence

**Perspective 1: Scope of activity**
Teaching is not only student interaction, therefore promotion committees will need to see evidence across a range of teaching activities. **Five activities** are suggested on page 3, each of differing proportion as an academic’s career progresses.

**Perspective 2: Source of evidence**
Since teaching activity has a broader scope than student interaction, evidence will be viewed from a range of sources. **Three sources** are identified on page 4, each with changing importance and volume as an academic’s career progresses.

**Perspective 3: Sphere of influence**
Similarly, university teachers have influence beyond their students. They are active across entire programs, across the university and, often, engage strongly with external accreditation bodies, professions, industry or government. Promotion committees will search for evidence of teaching leadership and impact in different **spheres of influence** from local to global, as depicted on page 5.

**Why define teaching?**
How teaching is defined and which aspects of academic work count as teaching can inform the process of evaluating teaching for promotion. Promotion committees need guidelines and criteria to evaluate teaching in an equivalent way to research.

In a rapidly changing university sector, it becomes even more important to define teaching. There is a pressing need to establish some common language around extremely complex and continually changing practice. Teaching in modern universities is increasingly likely to take a “non-traditional” approach, drawing on a diverse range of skills and developing new expertise. Given this, it is necessary to provide some definition of teaching that might be used for:

- Setting expectations in professional teaching standards
- Defining teaching activities for diverse teaching roles (e.g., sessional, research-intensive, clinical supervision, deans, educational developers)
- Foregrounding the impact of student diversity and choice of learning environment, and the subsequent impact on teaching
- Quality assurance of all aspects of learning environments (e.g., programs, subjects, laboratory and clinical work, resources, support, feedback)
- Developing theories and sharing practice about teaching, and
- Communicating the work of academics to the wider community, including governments, students and potential academics.

All of these have an impact on a university’s success and are relevant in promotion committee discussions. For an individual academic, continuing discussions on the scope of teaching activity are important to clarify the demands of the role, expectations and career directions.
Perspective 1: Scope of activity

It is important that the scope of teaching-related activity is defined for promotion. This will vary from university to university, with some having a broader definition of teaching related activities such as academic leadership and public engagement. The Promoting Teaching project identified the following five activities:

1. **Professional learning** – participating in teaching-related workshops and seminars; obtaining (or furthering) teaching qualifications
2. **Student engagement** – includes motivation, support and feedback; research supervision
3. **Curriculum development** – resources for courses; curriculum review, design and innovation; evaluation and alignment to standards
4. **Scholarship of teaching & learning** – presentations, grants and publications
5. **Leadership & collaboration** – mentorship, governance, peer review, course accreditation.

Teaching-related activity varies throughout a career, typically beginning with direct student interaction (see Figure 2). With opportunity, experience and ongoing professional learning, the profile of teaching activity may shift towards a greater emphasis on leadership and scholarship.

Different teaching activities will require different forms of evidence.

![Figure 2: A sample teaching profile showing changes in scope of activity, requiring different evidence at each level](image)

What is teaching?

From a review of the various frameworks used to describe teaching, it seems clear that any consideration of teaching at university level should include the five activities described above: professional learning; student engagement; curriculum development; scholarship; and leadership.

Many of these activities will be influenced by an understanding of learning and the learning environment, including the principles of adult learning, by the academic’s philosophy of teaching, and by the nature of the subject. The overall picture must also be considered, including equity, how the specific subject and the approaches to teaching align with institutional values and goals, and the broader context of tertiary education. These understandings are applicable regardless of whether the teaching is in the context of large scale core subjects, service subjects, smaller specialist topics, postgraduate coursework or research higher degree supervision. For a list of key references on these and other aspects of teaching, see Appendix 1.
Perspective 2: Source of evidence

Perspective 1 shifted the image of teaching from student interaction to at least four other teaching-related activities.

Similarly, Perspective 2 shifts the concept of source of evidence from student evaluations to multiple sources of evidence. A range of sources can facilitate triangulation of data; one source might not be sufficiently convincing on its own, but might become persuasive when supported by others.

The Promoting Teaching Project identified three sources of evidence which applicants may use to support their case for excellence. Which particular forms of evidence will be expected from each source depends on the promotion policy at each institution. As far as possible, evidence should be verifiable either in documentary form or by peer review:

1. **Personal** – evidence of reflective practice, personal professional development and/or commitment to innovation; evidence of engagement with relevant educational literature or theory, eg how a teaching philosophy or theory informs the applicant’s teaching practice.

2. **Students** – how students perceive the work of the applicant, through scores in evaluations and qualitative comments; measurements of student achievements in courses the applicant has taught, developed or led, and how student evaluation scores compare with school averages.

3. **Peers** – evidence of recognition by colleagues in their institution, or at a wider national and international level, including Head of School comments, peer observations and peer reviews of curriculum development.

Figure 3 illustrates how the three sources of evidence about teaching-related activities – personal, students and peers – change at different levels of career progression. Both the proportions of each type of evidence and their impact will vary through a career, for example a lecturer might have more evidence from personal reflection and impact on students, whereas a more senior academic might draw more heavily on evidence of impact on peers.

The mix of evidence provided will differ for each individual. Each will be uniquely assessed by the promotion committee with regard to an individual’s particular focus, role and/or career profile, and according to the expected level of achievement for a lecturer, senior lecturer or professor.

![Figure 3: Sources of evidence showing changes with level of promotion](image-url)
**Perspective 3: Sphere of influence**

Due to the collaborative nature of teaching and teaching-related activities, academics operate in multiple spheres of influence (see Figure 4).

Influence is a key indicator of leadership. More than anything else, promotion committees look at applications for evidence of leadership. It is sometimes assumed that teaching leadership is evidenced by a list of university leadership positions. However, promotion committees should also seek evidence of external impact. University teaching dictates strong collaboration with communities beyond the institution, for example for external accreditation of programs, alignment with the workforce needs of industry, national policy development and leadership for continuing enhancement of the discipline.

Some early career academics arrive in academia with many years’ experience in industry, private practice or government and are already influential nationally and internationally.

Others will extend their sphere of influence as they progress through their academic career, from impact in a school or faculty (eg active participation in course reviews), through to university leadership positions (eg chairing education committees) and then onto roles in the global community.

Promotion to professor always requires evidence of international impact. For professorial promotion based on excellent teaching, committees will seek evidence of national and international leadership in teaching, for example leadership of industry peak bodies, development of professional accreditation and standards, invitations to international conferences, presidency of a professional association, internationally prescribed textbooks, leadership of national discipline reviews or international collaborations for innovation in university education.

---

**Is teaching an individual or a collaborative effort?**

Excellence at the program level is achieved through collaboration, rather than “competition between individual teachers” (Gibbs, 2012, p 32). A focus on the improvement of programs and teams gives better outcomes than a focus on program components and individuals (p 21). Gibbs challenges the sector to refocus enhancement strategies on the whole degree program and to develop recognition for contribution to the teaching team rather than as individuals. This might, for example, call for a change of emphasis to reward leadership of teaching as well as significant contributions to collaborative works. Leaders should engage teachers in dialog and create functioning “communities of practice” to enable sharing of “values and approaches” (p 21). Recognition and encouragement for “distributed leadership” can reward academics who make substantial contributions outside formal leadership roles (Jones et al, 2010).

A review of the UK National Teaching Fellowship Scheme similarly emphasised the importance of teamwork and leading teams to excellence (Skelton, 2004). The review recommended that critical interdisciplinarity should be fostered to strengthen collaborative work including across networks and centres of excellence. A more recent review reaffirmed the need to harness the collective skills and expertise of excellent teachers (Rickinson, Spencer and Stainton, 2012).
Promoting teaching: making evidence count

Principles for putting the evidence perspectives into practice

Perspectives 1, 2 & 3 described a shift from a narrow understanding of teaching evidence to a broad range of teaching activities, sources of evidence and spheres of influence. For these perspectives to inform improvement of policy and practice, the Promoting Teaching project proposes the following four Principles. These relate to Benchmarks 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12 in the Promoting Teaching Good Practice Framework.

**Principle 1: Alignment**

There is tight alignment between promotion policies, promotion application forms, recruitment processes, career development pro formas, performance expectation frameworks and teaching grants/awards, based on a published university definition of teaching and guide to evidence about teaching (Benchmarks 6 & 7).

**Principle 2: Flexibility**

Forms and guidelines for promotion encourage academics to present evidence about teaching across a broad scope of teaching activities, from multiple sources including peers, and reflecting multiple spheres of influence. Each academic teaching profile is recognised as unique. There is no assumption that an academic will be active in every area of activity or that “one size fits all” (Benchmark 9).

**Principle 3: Systems**

The university collects and validates an array of data and evidence about teaching, both to support promotion applicants and to provide meaningful institutional analytics for promotion committees and university strategic planning (Benchmark 10).

**Principle 4: Training**

The university provides regular, mandatory induction and training for promotion committee members, academic supervisors and applicants on how to demonstrate and evaluate individual teaching achievements (Benchmark 12).

“Just” teaching – or a complex, multifaceted profession?

Shulman (1987) considered the work of secondary school teachers and identified nine forms of knowledge that expert teachers appeared to demonstrate: • Content knowledge • General pedagogical knowledge • Curriculum knowledge • Pedagogical content knowledge • Knowledge of learners • Knowledge of educational contexts • Knowledge of educational ends, purposes and values.

Although Shulman did not claim that this framework was universal, it does provide one way of thinking about university teaching. It covers far more than what goes on in the classroom. Many of the broader notions, such as knowledge of educational contexts are often ignored in statements about teaching.

Others have identified the importance of leadership, reflection, scholarly activity, self-review and professional development. These are evident in all expert teachers, particularly at university level.

The UK Professional Standards Framework (Higher Education Authority (HEA), 2011) suggests a three component model, where areas of activity include curriculum development, assessment and ongoing professional learning about teaching; core knowledge covers not only the subject matter but also knowledge of students, and appropriate learning technologies; and professional values covers aspects of equity and concern for minority groups, as well as the broader context of higher education.

In Australia, the Office for Learning and Teaching provides criteria against which teaching excellence awards are judged. These include: approaches that influence, motivate and inspire students to learn; development of curricula and resources that reflect a command of the field; approaches to assessment, feedback and support that foster independent learning; support for equity and diversity; and scholarly activity. Similarly, UK National Teaching Fellows criteria cover individual and collegial aspects of excellence.
Based on the perspectives and principles on measuring teaching, the Promoting Teaching Matrix on the following pages is a model for articulating and evidencing teaching in academic promotion.

The Matrix outlines scope of teaching activity, sources of evidence and spheres of influence. It includes examples of evidence, highlights the collaborative nature of teaching and indicates likely phases of career where evidence might be collected.

The Matrix can be used to map the broad spectrum of teaching activity and evidence of teaching at the institution. Mapping using the Matrix enables a university to:

- improve the quality of applications and decisions (Principle 1)
- identify evidence that can/should be collected and validated centrally for promotion applicants (Principle 3). This can also provide data which is valuable for institutional analytics
- articulate clear guidelines which clarify evidence and expectations for applicants, supervisors and promotion committees (Principle 2)
- enhance understanding and transparency, both through the resulting documents and guidelines and in applicant workshops and committee inductions (Principles 2 & 4).

Doesn’t a map of activities and evidence have a place already, in our performance expectations / professional standards framework?

Many institutions have a set of performance expectations (PEFs) for each academic level. These expectations often map onto a professional standards framework (PSF). While PEFs and PSFs are related to performance, they are different from the criteria for promotion. PEFs and PSFs set a minimum standard, whereas in applications for promotion, committees are looking for excellence beyond what is normally expected at that level. Several types of evidence when considered holistically might demonstrate that an individual is performing at a high level, suggesting their potential for a role above their current level of activity.

Typically, successful applicants are able to demonstrate through evidence that they are already having an impact at the level for which they are applying and, if applying at Chair/Reader level, evidence of sustained impact. Many applicants are also innovating or contributing in ways that are not anticipated in the PEFs and PSFs for their role.

Notions of teaching excellence in PEF and PSF documents, like those represented in criteria for some promotion policies, can also be instrumental or fail to give sufficient attention to leadership of teaching and teaching expertise, deep knowledge of teaching and learning processes in higher education and the changing higher education climate in which we operate.
The Promoting Teaching Matrix: perspectives & principles in practice

A model for universities to enhance understanding of evidence that counts for promotion at various phases of academic career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope of teaching activity</th>
<th>Source of evidence</th>
<th>Example of evidence</th>
<th>Phase/s of career</th>
<th>External sphere of influence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Learning</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University teaching preparation/induction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Certificate of completion</td>
<td>Early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of formal qualification in teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>University transcript</td>
<td>Early to mid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendances at internal or external teaching-related workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional records</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and experience from the relevant industry/profession</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal records of professional experience and training</td>
<td>All (if relevant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with Professional Standards Framework</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer reviewed teaching portfolio</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of teaching philosophy/teaching principles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement presented</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher / subject / course evaluations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal survey reports</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Retention and pass rates; student prizes and projects</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer observations of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of undergraduate and taught postgraduate projects / research degree continuations and/or completions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional records; HDR students supervised (successful completions)</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional or national teaching awards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Awards that validate nominated areas of expertise</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate research engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Documented strategies; student evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviews of resources developed (including online, media-rich and open resources)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reviews</td>
<td>All (more likely earlier)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prizes and citations related to resource development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Award certificate</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject/course development, curriculum review</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reviews</td>
<td>All (more likely mid to later)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer evaluations of curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal review reports</td>
<td>More likely mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful introduction and development of major innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration; peer review, student evaluations</td>
<td>Any stage but more likely from mid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National curriculum, accreditation, standards</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invitations; frameworks</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbook</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adoption; reviews; sales; library copies</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scholarship of Learning &amp; Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of scholarship direction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Statement presented</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of a scholarly approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Peer review of documented refinements</td>
<td>Develops early to mid-career</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer-reviewed publications</td>
<td></td>
<td>Publications; citations</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter or workshop leader</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invitation to present; program and evaluation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning and teaching grants</td>
<td></td>
<td>Grant application; report</td>
<td>Mid onwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External referees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership &amp; Collaboration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career development by supervisor/Head/Dean</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal reports</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor management and cross-campus leadership role in subject or course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reports from tutors</td>
<td>Mid, can be early</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of cross-campus alignment and consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reports of action and impact</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership survey results</td>
<td></td>
<td>Survey results</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent feedback from mentees; achievements as a result of mentoring</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal teaching leadership roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independent reports of contribution or actions</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attracting funding to support development or maintenance of subject or course</td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds awarded; outcomes</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service on or chairing of committees / reviews / policy development</td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee actions as a result of your input</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External leader / reviewer / advisor roles</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number of invitations to undertake peer review; outcomes of advisory work</td>
<td>Mid to later</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities that involve the collaborative efforts of a team

Sphere of influence may extend beyond the university
The Promoting Teaching Matrix is a model to underpin a university’s review of academic promotion policies and processes based on "making evidence count".

The Matrix could also be used to:

- underpin decisions about teaching award and grant applications
- inform processes for recruitment and selection of academics
- influence processes for probation, career development and performance review.

Ideally, the Matrix assists a university to better align all the above areas, by enhancing understandings and expectations for evidence of teaching.

Adopting and adapting the Promoting Teaching Matrix may be:

- a preliminary step to a major review of university promotion policies and processes (see accompanying Guide to Institutional Benchmarking), or
- one step within a review, or
- a recommendation arising from a review.

However the Matrix is used, there are some clear steps to consider when developing an enhanced approach to evidence of teaching:

- engage the university community in discussion to define the nature and scope of teaching within the institution’s context
- consult with the academic community on successive drafts

---

**How is university teaching changing?**

University teaching is not a stable, unchanging enterprise. Rather it is dynamic and fast-moving, multi-faceted profession that is constantly changing to meet new developments and challenges. In recent years, these have included:

- increasing university participation – requiring expertise in developing inclusive curricula to cater for the diverse student body
- an emphasis on international markets – requiring expertise in intercultural education
- marketisation – requiring an ability to retain the core educational values in the face of neoliberal pressures towards commodification
- increased accountability – requiring expertise in quality assurance.
- the ubiquity of online access, faster transfer speeds and greater ICT skills, particularly among young people, has led to a competitive sector including MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) and growing enrolments in off-campus provision – requiring sophisticated approaches to distance education as well as high-level ICT skills.

Not only does the nature of the act of teaching change in these conditions; there are also impacts on teaching matters such as curriculum design, assessment, and the type of student outcomes.

These pressures impact on the experience for many university teachers and demand new forms of expertise. As yet, these new forms of expertise are not widely acknowledged in mechanisms for the reward and recognition for teaching.
select which evidence can be collected at the institutional level and establish systems for that collection

• provide portfolio tools for evidence collection and analytics tools, for example for citation and impact data

• develop resources on academic promotion and guides to evidence of teaching at each promotion level

• promote the new approach and guides to academics at induction, during staff development, at promotion workshops and on university websites

• use your evidence guides in training of promotion committee members

• establish systems for evaluating the new approach.

There are many ways a guide or resource could be presented, depending on the unique approach of each university.

The Matrix in Action on the next page is one example of a guide for applicants and promotion committees based on the model in the Promoting Teaching Matrix.

How is scholarship of teaching differentiated from research?

Scholarship of teaching demands an inquiry ethic, critical reflection and scrutiny by peers (Andreson, 2000, cited in Kreber 2002, p.7). It can include:

• action research on learning and teaching practice, sometimes funded by internal teaching grants

• scholarly outcomes from teaching innovations, such as presentations and publications

• a teaching philosophy informed by pedagogical theory and educational research.

Sample (2013) has suggested that "a creative or intellectual act becomes scholarship when it is public and circulates in a community of peers that evaluates and builds upon it".

Scholarship of teaching informs teaching practice by bringing together the following perspectives: understanding of the learning environment, principles of adult learning, teaching in the discipline, equity considerations and alignment of learning outcomes to institutional goals (Kreber, 2002).

Some institutions may specify which publications and grants should be included under research and which under teaching. At others, it is left to academics to decide, provided these are not double-counted.

Universities traditionally were institutions where discipline research informed teaching, but the growth of tertiary education is creating academics who may be teaching in areas related to but outside their direct expertise, or who may have no research expectation in their job description. In this case their teaching is informed by research from the discipline of education, that is, scholarly teaching. At some (ill-defined) point an academic's scholarship of the teaching practices of themselves and/or their colleagues may cross over into becoming research in the discipline of education. Scholarship of teaching (or discourse) is on a continuum of research activity that also includes integration or synthesis, application or engagement, and discovery (partly derived from Boyer, 1990).
# Promoting teaching: making evidence count

## The Matrix in Action: sample guide for applicants and promotion committees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Impact on students</strong></th>
<th><strong>Impact on peers</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with staff development activities</td>
<td>Peer supported evidence of involvement in faculty/university level initiatives (eg policy, staff development etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of scholarship and research with teaching</td>
<td>Peer supported evidence of leadership at faculty/university level initiatives (eg policy, staff development etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses attended and professional development undertaken</td>
<td>Successful mentorship, peer reviewer, chair of faculty/university committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment of teaching performance</td>
<td>National / international impact (eg invited speaker, advisor, consultant, editor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of relevant quality assurance frameworks and benchmarks</td>
<td>Outcomes of cross-university collaborations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement with professional standards framework</td>
<td>Authorship of textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.g. HEA Senior Fellowship</td>
<td>Peer reviewer of pedagogic grant proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership of relevant professional bodies</td>
<td>PI or Co-I on major grants for pedagogic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional teaching award</td>
<td>Chair of faculty or university committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent student feedback from course and module questionnaires and other sources</td>
<td>External examiner / reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from student experience surveys</td>
<td>QAA reviewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student achievement</td>
<td>Offices of responsibility in relevant professional bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student progression</td>
<td>Invited reviewer/assessor of teaching at comparable institutions (eg for programme approval, periodic review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student retention on courses or modules</td>
<td>Invited reviewer of pedagogic grant proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of teaching materials (eg Blackboard materials, learning packages)</td>
<td>PI or Co-I on grants for pedagogic research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful outcome of supervision of UG or PG research projects / PG research students</td>
<td>Accreditation of courses by professional bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Departmental leadership in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership of Departmental Learning and Teaching Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receipt of awards for teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prizes and citations for coursework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Providing mentorship to colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Invited authorship of textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editorial and membership of journal boards or referee for journals in the area of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External examiner comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publications, presentation or workshops on teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Senior Lecturer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual evidence could include, eg, some of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Reader/Associate Professor & Professor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual evidence could include, eg, some of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
The sample guide highlights the relationship between sources of evidence and level of career progression. For each promotion level, it gives examples of evidence which could be used to substantiate a case for promotion. The examples are not intended as a definitive list because evidence will vary between individuals, career phases, disciplines and academic roles. Likewise, some activities may be expected to be part of roles at every academic level at some universities. For promotion to higher levels a wider and more significant impact should be demonstrated.

**Conclusion: making evidence count**

The model in *Making Evidence Count* brings together perspectives and principles on evidence about teaching that will enable university promotion committees to better recognise teaching achievement in promotion applications. Understanding how teaching can be “measured” is a cornerstone of the Promoting Teaching Good Practice Framework for benchmarking promotion policies, processes and practices. The Promoting Teaching team welcomes feedback on the model and invites universities to find benchmarking partners via our website. Please also use the website to submit Good Practice Examples to add to the higher education sector’s growing understanding of reward and recognition of teaching:

www.promotingteaching.com
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Appendix 2: Promoting Teaching Good Practice Framework

The Promoting Teaching Good Practice Framework sets out six dimensions and 18 benchmarks for institutional review. The Promoting Teaching Matrix supports benchmarks 6, 7, 9, 10 & 12.

### Plans & policies

1. University plans reflect a commitment to parity of esteem between teaching achievements and other achievements in promotion
2. University policies reflect a commitment to parity of esteem between teaching achievements and other achievements in promotion

### Perceptions & practices

3. University leaders support parity of esteem for teaching achievement in promotion
4. Academic leaders support parity of esteem for teaching achievement in promotion
5. Peer interactions support parity of esteem for teaching achievement in promotion

### Promotion applicants

6. Potential applicants are offered advice and assistance on evidence of teaching achievement, which is aligned to policy and career planning
7. Academic mentors and supervisors are equipped to give consistent and accurate advice to applicants on teaching evidence and teaching pathways to promotion

### Promotion applications

8. Parity of esteem for teaching is articulated in promotion forms and guidelines
9. Application forms and guidelines for evidencing teaching/teaching scholarship are clear and detailed
10. Systems are in place to collect and validate evidence of teaching for promotion applications

### Promotion committee

11. Membership of promotion committees is appropriately balanced to represent teaching
12. Promotion committees are well-prepared to evaluate the teaching achievements of applicants
13. Promotion committee procedures are designed to support consistent and equitable decisions on teaching
14. Where there are processes for external evaluation, attention to teaching mirrors attention to other areas of achievement
15. Promotion committee procedures for evaluating teaching are transparent to current and prospective staff

### Outcomes & review

16. Promotion outcomes can be demonstrated to be sound and equitable for teaching
17. A transparent cycle of review tracks recognition of teaching in academic promotion
18. Academic staff perceive that teaching achievements are valued in promotion processes
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