

Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching

second edition

Graham Gibbs and Trevor Habeshaw

National Co-ordination Team **NCT**

Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund **TQEF**



Published by
TQEF National Co-ordination Team
Centre for Higher Education Practice
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA

Tel: 44 (0)1908 858434

Fax: 44 (0)1908 858438

www.ncteam.ac.uk

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching – a guide to good practice
second edition

ISBN 07492 6680 5

© The Open University 2003

Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching – a guide to good practice

Introduction to the second edition

Policy initiatives to recognise and reward excellent teaching

Since the first edition of the Good Practice Guide on Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching was published in 2002, a number of developments at government and funding council level have underlined the current significance of the issues discussed in this publication for higher education. The recent White Paper (January 2003) and the strategic plan of the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) both place increasing emphasis on institutions finding ways to reward and recognise teaching quality.

The Future of Higher Education

The White Paper, 'The Future of Higher Education', declares that the Government will "celebrate and reward teaching excellence." The Government has stated that it desires to "see better pay differentiation for teachers, with institutions rewarding those who teach well" (paragraph 4.23). It goes on to say that HEFCE will be asked to release funds "to those institutions that can demonstrate that it will be spent on rewards for their best teaching staff."

In addition to the expectation that institutions will reward excellence, there are three new central initiatives being introduced which are also designed to contribute to the encouragement of best practice in teaching. These are namely:

- the establishment of a Higher Education Academy whose overarching role will be "to support continuous professional development for teaching in HE, by sponsoring and developing good practice, setting professional standards, accrediting training, conducting research, and helping develop policy on teaching and learning" (4.25)
- the expansion of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme from the current level of twenty fellowships per year to up to fifty per year
- an invitation to institutions to bid to establish Centres of Excellence in Teaching and Learning. Up to £500,000 per year for five years, and the opportunity to bid for up to £2 million each for teaching infrastructure is being made available.

Collectively this represents a substantial investment by the Government to encourage good teaching practice and to reward those who are excellent in teaching.

The HEFCE Strategic Plan (2003/35) states that one of the Funding Council's objectives is "to provide rewards to celebrate and encourage excellence in all modes, pedagogies and approaches to teaching, and to promote the professional development of teaching staff."

In the section of the strategic plan entitled Enhancing Excellence in Learning and Teaching HEFCE goes on to say, "we endorse the aim to improve the status and recognition of excellent teaching and learning as a key element in the mission of higher education alongside research.

We will increase the rewards for excellent teaching by extending and targeting our funding for human resource strategies" (paragraphs 1 and 12).

Links to Human Resources Strategies

In 2001 the HEFCE initiative entitled Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education (01/16) invited all higher education institutions to submit a human resource strategy. Funds were allocated to implement these strategies providing that certain priority areas were addressed. The emphasis at this time was on such issues as recruitment and retention of staff, staff development initiatives that would prepare staff for future changes, development of equal opportunities policies, reviewing staff needs, annual performance reviews and action to tackle poor performance. There was no requirement to address the

issue of rewarding excellence in teaching, although some institutions were already introducing this element into their promotion processes. In these institutions, schemes for recognising quality in teaching – such as Awards and Fellowships – were being introduced using teaching quality enhancement funding as part of their learning and teaching strategy. Heads of Educational Development (or equivalent post) and the Pro Vice Chancellors Academic were often the initiators of many of these schemes and they were often implemented independently of the institution's human resource (HR) strategy.

In other cases these schemes were being supported and implemented with educational development specialists working hand-in-hand with the personnel or human resources department. In the best examples, there was alignment between the objectives of the learning and teaching strategy and the HR strategy, so that the latter clearly served the requirements of the former. Indeed it has been claimed that, "integration between HR strategies and wider corporate goals and other institutional strategies, including teaching and learning strategies and research, was much improved." (Consultation on the Rewarding and Developing Staff: 2004-05, 2003/33).

In paragraph 28 of the same consultative paper it is stated quite categorically that career progression for teaching must be addressed. It reads, "we would also require HEIs to update their HR strategies to ensure that they cover those issues in the White Paper that link to their own priorities. As a minimum, all HEIs would be expected to address their explicit approach to teaching career progression, including specific recognition schemes."

There could be no clearer statement than this that the higher education sector must consider, not only how to reward excellence, but more generally how teaching is taken into account in promotion policies.

A complex issue

The research undertaken by Graham Gibbs and Trevor Habeshaw for this publication shows on the one hand that there has been a good deal of progress towards finding ways of rewarding recognising teaching quality, and yet it also highlights some of the many issues which institutions face when they implement such schemes. Some of the issues identified and explored include:

- **definitions of teaching quality in relation to institutional goals and the learning and teaching strategy**
what do we understand teaching to include? And what are the criteria for excellence?
- **setting criteria for promotion in relation to defining excellence**
should the criteria require evidence of scholarly publications relating to teaching or is evidence of excellent teaching performance sufficient?
- **short term changes of role**
how can individuals who take on leadership of a development project, or are awarded a fixed term, 'Teaching Fellow' post, return to their substantive posts?
- **small number of rewards**
when schemes only select a few for promotion on the basis of their teaching excellence what message does this give to the majority of staff?
- **institutional cultures**
how is it possible to ensure that a promotion or reward for teaching excellence benefits the person's long term career prospects?
- **orientating staff for future developments**
how can promotion policies help to direct staff into teaching developments that will meet the future needs of the institution and the sector?

These and other issues continue to be debated by both those leading on learning and teaching and those responsible for personnel, or human resources, policies. Sometimes these two functions are separated by distinct line management structures. It will require the leaders in both learning and teaching and personnel services to work together if long term strategies for rewarding and recognising teaching quality are to be successfully developed and sustained.

David Gosling
Co-Director
TQEF National Co-ordination Team

Recognising and Rewarding Excellent Teaching – a guide to good practice

Contents

Introduction.....	i
Executive summary.....	1
Section one:	
Approaches to recognition and reward.....	3
Recognition of teaching in appointment and probation.....	3
Recognition through appointment mechanisms.....	3
Recognition through probation mechanisms.....	4
Rewarding through promotion and pay.....	4
Reward through promotion.....	5
Reward through increased pay.....	9
Reward through creating teaching-oriented career paths.....	10
Recognition and increased status through awards and titles.....	11
Teaching prizes and awards.....	11
Titles.....	13
Recognition through new teaching related roles.....	14
Teaching development roles.....	14
Recognition of teaching development activity in duty allocations.....	14
Funding for leadership of development projects.....	14
Membership of institution-wide development teams.....	15
Membership of 'Teaching Academies'.....	15
Recognition and reward for teaching-related staff.....	16
References.....	17
Section two:	
Case studies of institutional systems that recognise and reward excellent teachers.....	18
A comprehensive 'Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme' linked to institutional goals.....	18

Recognising and rewarding excellent teaching in a research environment.....	19
An institutional version of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.....	20
Central and Faculty reward schemes in a research environment.....	21
A Teaching Fellowship Scheme that funds projects linked to institutional priorities.....	23
A Teaching Award scheme with a clear definition of teaching excellence	24
An explicit attempt to change the culture and to balance rewards for teaching with those for research	25
Excellence awards and teaching fellowships designed to support strategically targeted efforts to transform teaching.....	26
A Teaching Fellowship scheme involving both financial reward and a development role	27

Section three:

Issues raised by mechanisms to recognise and reward excellent teachers

Competence, excellence and leadership.....	29
Rewarding past performance vs orienting future efforts	29
Generic definitions of teaching quality vs strategic goals.....	30
Permanent promotion vs temporary benefit	30
Small number of staff with big reward vs large number of staff with small reward.....	30
Rewarding individual excellence vs rewarding collaboration	31
Peripheral short term changes or permanent changes to core roles and career paths....	31
The roles of the department and the centre	31
Institutional size.....	32
Institutional cultures.....	33
Developing standards	33
Time scales	33
Supporting parallel mechanisms.....	34
Encouraging the others.....	34
Comparisons with rewarding excellence in research.....	34
Further reading.....	36

Executive summary

1. The first strategic purpose of the Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE's) learning and teaching strategy is:

“Encouragement and reward. We wish to increase the status of learning and teaching, (and) reward high quality...” (HEFCE 1999a)

While there is an individual strand to the HEFCE's Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund (TQEF), in the form of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme (NTFS), the main way in which individual teachers' excellence is recognised and rewarded is through institutions' own mechanisms. The institutional strand of the TQEF has encouraged institutions to further develop mechanisms to recognise and reward excellent teachers. In 1994 institutions reported making, on average, only 12% of promotion decisions primarily on the grounds of teaching excellence and 38% of institutions reported not making any such promotions (Gibbs, 1995). Since then the picture has changed. The proportion of institutions including recognition and reward mechanisms in their learning and teaching strategy increased from 12% in 1998 to 65% in 2000 (HEFCE 2001) and developments have been rapid and varied.

2. The HEFCE Rewarding and Developing Staff in Higher Education initiative has not yet resulted in institutions orienting their Human Resource Development (HRD) approach to any great extent “to increase the status of learning and teaching, (and) reward high quality...” An analysis of the (mainly ‘emerging’) HRD strategies submitted by institutions to the HEFCE in 2001 did not reveal significant evidence of reward mechanisms for excellent teaching even when such mechanisms were already contained in institutions' existing learning and teaching strategies. At present HRD strategies appear to be operating in parallel, rather than in synergy, with teaching improvement strategies.

3. This Guide to Good Practice distinguishes different recognition and reward strategies, describes the most common tactics and mechanisms used to implement these strategies, provides case studies setting these tactics in institutional contexts, and raises issues about the successful implementation of reward and recognition schemes. Where possible web addresses are provided in order to view the details of institutions' reward schemes and the documentation associated with them. Examples from other countries are used where this illustrates alternative approaches.

4. In the past the emphasis has been on reward for excellent teaching in the form of permanent promotions within existing career structures. Developments to promotion mechanisms have included:

- changing promotion criteria to include teaching
- defining teaching excellence more explicitly, sometimes with reference to scholarly literature about teaching and learning
- aligning definitions of excellence with institutional missions and learning and teaching strategies
- changing the way excellence in research, administration and teaching is combined or separated so that it is not so common for teaching excellence to carry less weight
- allowing teaching excellence to be the only criterion for promotion in some circumstances
- specifying requirements for the presentation of evidence about teaching, for example in the form of teaching portfolios, so that evidence is more convincing and carries more weight
- developing the sophistication of teachers' ability to collate and present evidence in teaching portfolios, often starting early in a teachers' career, during initial training or Institute for Learning and Teaching (ILT) accreditation, so that individual's evidence about their teaching has the same lengthy history as evidence about their research
- developing the sophistication of promotion panels in making judgements of evidence about teaching.

5. Some institutions have gone beyond adjustments to the existing career structure and have changed the career structure itself through:

- taking teaching competence and potential into account to a greater extent at appointment
- taking tougher requirements for evidence of teaching competence at probation
- introducing new teaching-focussed promotion opportunities, especially at senior levels, such as Readerships in Teaching and the possibility of Professorships which emphasise teaching achievements.

6. Institutions have also introduced 'teaching only' posts of a variety of kinds, sometimes with the same titles (such as 'Teaching Fellow') used for rewards in other institutions. However these almost always involve lower pay, poorer conditions of service and fixed term contracts and therefore have much lower status. Such teaching only posts probably achieve the opposite of what recognition and reward schemes achieve. Academics are likely to orient their behaviour so as to avoid the possibility of a career stuck in such inferior posts, by emphasising their research rather than their teaching.

7. There has been considerable development of mechanisms to recognise teaching excellence in ways that do not involve permanent promotion, including:

- temporary, fixed term, promotions
- teaching awards and prizes. Institutions have for example developed their own local version of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme and select their national nomination from amongst their internal Fellowship holders
- additional pay and/or increments, awarded in ways that take teaching achievements into account, sometimes linked to annual appraisal that focuses on teaching achievements
- publicity and events that showcase excellence
- additional titles, such as 'Teaching Fellow' and 'Teaching Co-ordinator' that ascribe status and recognition, with or without any changes in pay or terms and conditions
- encouragement, financial support and practical support to achieve ILT membership as recognition of teaching competence. ILT membership may be required for probation or even for all promotions, right up to professorships.

8. There has, in parallel, been a marked increase in investment in developments in teaching, in the form of 'Innovation Funds' that support teaching development projects. There was a five-fold increase between 1998 and 2000 in the number of institutions operating such schemes (HEFCE, 2001). This recognises teaching potential, initiative and willingness to engage with institutional priorities rather than simply recognising teaching excellence. Such funds often encourage innovation of a form that does not resemble traditional classroom teaching, such as the development of electronic learning resources. Outcomes of such funded projects are often publicised through websites and internal conferences about teaching that 'showcase' teaching achievements. Bidding for such funds is competitive and winning a grant is a form of recognition and may lead on to winning external grants, such as from the HEFCE's Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning (FDTL). Directors of such large scale, externally funded teaching development projects are more likely to be promoted and a growing number have since been awarded Professorships. Often internal institutional grant holders are also allocated titles, such as 'Teaching Fellow', and may be given personal financial benefits, research assistance and administrative support, and release from some duties, in addition to the grant. The boundary between funding teaching development and recognising excellence in teaching is blurred in these cases.

9. There is evidence of the sharing of recognition and reward mechanisms between institutions. For example a 'Teaching Fellow' scheme highlighted in the Funding Council Circular on learning and teaching strategies (HEFCE, 1999b) has since been adopted in similar forms in several institutions.

Section one:

Approaches to recognition and reward

This section introduces a wide range of mechanisms being adopted by institutions to recognise and reward excellent teachers. It describes each distinct mechanism, highlights issues associated with its use, and provides illustrations from institutional documentation.

Recognition of teaching in appointment and probation

10. One of the strongest mechanisms to recognise the value of teaching is to make sure you appoint people in the first place who, at the very least, value teaching and, who, ideally, show potential as excellent teachers. An unbalanced emphasis during selection on research strengths can cause problems later, not just with academics' teaching competence, but with less tractable issues involving their values and willingness to take teaching seriously. While this is not easy to do through economical selection procedures most institutions have probation mechanisms, or requirements to be met before tenure is granted, which can pick up serious problems associated with inadequate teaching or inappropriately limited orientation to teaching.

Recognition through appointment mechanisms

11. Teaching can be recognised, and good teaching rewarded, through appointment procedures. At this stage a department might be looking for evidence of competence, rather than of excellence, and, more importantly, evidence that applicants take teaching and its development seriously.

Emphasising teaching in advertisements and job specifications

12. It can be made clear to applicants:

- how teaching is valued and emphasised, for example describing departmental teaching development activities
- that if ILT membership has not already been achieved, it will be expected to be achieved before probation is completed
- that training is compulsory for inexperienced teachers
- how individuals' excellence at teaching will be recognised and rewarded in the future.

Emphasising the role teaching plays in the career path of staff may help to attract appropriate applicants and deter those who do not value teaching or intend to give it any priority in their careers.

Emphasising teaching in application forms

13. Applicants may be expected not simply to list their teaching experience but to provide a concise 'teaching portfolio' presenting evidence of excellence. Such portfolios may resemble those later used in applying for promotion. As applicants will come from many different institutional contexts it may be difficult to specify the form such a portfolio should take but it might be expected to include:

- teaching experience
- training undertaken and teaching development activities engaged in
- evidence of competence (such as student feedback, student performance, extracts from external examiners' reports)
- a statement of the applicants' rationale for teaching: why they teach in the way they do
- their aspirations for development as a teacher and for contribution to teaching in the department.

ILT membership may be accepted as a substitute for such a portfolio, as this involves either the completion of an ILT accredited formal teacher training programme, many of which are assessed through teaching portfolios, or direct entry via submission to the ILT of an acceptable teaching portfolio.

Emphasising teaching in selection procedures

14. Selection may involve a simulated presentation to staff or students in order to assess teaching skills. Such (usually short) simulations may be artificial and may emphasise formal presentation over interaction or facilitation skills, and classroom skills over course design and development. In the USA applicants for positions at top research institutions, such as Princeton University, are required to present what they term a 'pedagogical colloquium' – a seminar about how they would teach and assess a designated course, and how they would develop it over the next five years. This assesses understanding of course design issues and commitment to development rather than only classroom skills.

Recognition through probation mechanisms

15. Increasingly institutions are making it clear to new staff that even for outstanding researchers hired for their research strengths, a basic level of teaching competence, and commitment to developing teaching, is required.

Requiring qualifications or ILT membership for probation

16. Many institutions have made ILT membership, or successful completion of a formal teacher training programme, a formal requirement for completion of probation. Almost all Postgraduate Certificate in HE courses in England are ILT accredited and so this amounts to the same thing. A permanent position may not be confirmed until membership or course completion is achieved, or fixed-term contracts may be terminated.

Teaching-focussed review or appraisal for probation

17. Institutions may conduct a formal review of the successful completion of probation, and this may include:

- evidence that sufficient teaching experience has been achieved
- a record from observation of teaching
- student feedback from a standardised questionnaire so that ratings can be interpreted against norms
- a teaching portfolio
- a report from a mentor or teaching supervisor
- a cumulative record from annual appraisal that includes a review of teaching.

Rewarding through promotion and pay

18. Every institution already has its own promotion mechanisms. For some years almost all procedures have included teaching amongst promotion criteria, though this has not often been reflected in the proportion of promotions decided primarily on grounds of teaching excellence (Gibbs, 1995). To reward excellent teaching in an effective way, within existing career structures, pay structures and job titles, requires additional steps to be taken.

Reward through promotion

Clear criteria

19. What excellent teaching is considered to consist of needs to be specified unambiguously. If what excellent teaching looks like is unclear, or disputed, then it can be very difficult for those seeking promotion to select evidence to make a convincing case. In contrast there is broad agreement about what evidence of research excellence should consist of and so it is easier to agree on promotion for excellent researchers.

20. Definitions may be drawn from the literature on learning and teaching, as from The University of Technology, Sydney, quoted below, where the definition embodies a 'student focus' conception of teaching which has been demonstrated to be associated with better quality approaches to learning by students. Such research-based definitions have the advantage of having associated research-based measurement tools that can contribute to a teachers' case for promotion. The 'Approaches to Studying Inventory' measures the quality of student learning, the 'Course Experience Questionnaire' measures students' response to course design features and the 'Approaches to Teaching Inventory' measures teachers' approach to teaching.

Extract of a definition of good teaching, University of Technology, Sydney

"Good teaching is teaching which helps students to learn ... it encourages high quality student learning. It discourages the superficial approach to learning and encourages active engagement with the subject matter. This does not imply that good teaching always results in high quality student learning but that it is designed to do so and that it is practices in a way likely to lead to high quality learning ...good teaching is that which encourages in the learner, no matter what the subject content, motivation to learn, desire to understand, perseverance, independence, a respect for the truth and a desire to pursue learning."

(Lublin and Prosser, 1994)

21. In common with the University of Sydney, which is a research-oriented university, the University of Edinburgh has, since 1994, defined excellent teaching not in terms of what teachers do, but in terms of the consequences for student learning. This acknowledges the wide range of possibly successful approaches to teaching that can achieve successful outcomes and does not privilege any particular approach. A student-focussed definition also relies on evidence that is more reliable and valid than features of teacher performance (see Macdonald, 1998).

22. Definitions of excellence may also relate to a university's mission or learning and teaching strategy. For example there may be a considerable emphasis on widening participation, student retention and supporting students from diverse backgrounds. In this context a generic definition of excellent teaching might inappropriately encourage teachers to use traditional methods better suited to a well qualified and homogeneous student body. However expertly such traditional methods might be used they might not help the institution or the students much. There are an increasing number of examples of defining what teaching excellence means so as to re-orient teachers in their efforts. There is no mention of lecturing or indeed of any classroom teaching, as 'performance', in the definitions below. Instead they include institutional concerns (such as efficient use of resources) and preferences for the process of teaching improvement involved (for example 'scholarship of teaching' and 'team working').

Examples of criteria for teaching awards that link to institutional priorities

“Creating learning experiences and assessments that reflect the integration of discipline and transferable skills.

Support for the development of students’ ability to learn independently and with others.

Utilising theory and publications on teaching and learning to develop course design, teaching and assessment.”

Teaching Fellowships, Napier University, <http://www.eds.napier.ac.uk/eddev/fellows.htm>.

“A scholarly approach to teaching (i.e. informed by sound educational ideas and subject scholarship).

Improves student performance (i.e. appropriate learning outcomes are achieved).

Concern for student development (the focus of the work is on enhancing the experience of learning for students).

Effective team working (colleagues have been involved in appropriate ways).

Efficient use of resources (the work shows due regard for value for money and effort).”

Encouraging and Rewarding Excellent Teaching, within the Teaching and Learning Strategy of Coventry University, <http://www.coventry.ac.uk/structur/tlstrat.htm#annex2>.

Different criteria for different levels of promotion

23. One difficulty encountered in some promotions schemes is that there is insufficient distinction between different levels of promotion in terms of what kind of teaching excellence is sought. Competence as a teacher may be required for probation or tenure, and excellence at teaching for promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer ... and then what for Principal Lecturer or for Professor? A very high level of excellence? But what might that look like? Some institutions clearly distinguish what they are looking for at each level.

Alverno College standard for promotion to ‘Experienced Assistant Professor’

Alverno College uses not simply criteria for promotion but also clearly defined standards (what they call ‘interpretive statements’) for each level of promotion. Once a candidate can demonstrate that they have achieved this standard they are promoted to the next level and there is no competition with others involved. These standards relate very closely to their institutional approach to outcome-based education and contrast markedly with the Sydney and Edinburgh approaches in which there is no institutional preference for pedagogy. The standard for promotion to ‘Experienced Assistant Professor’ includes:

- “creates learning experiences and assessments that reflect integration of discipline and generic abilities
- organises learning experiences that assist students to achieve outcomes
- provides feedback directed towards specific abilities and individual need
- responds to students in a variety of settings with sensitivity to background and learning style
- generates student enthusiasm for learning
- refines teaching practice based on self-assessment and feedback.

Experienced Assistant Professors develop a more comprehensive view of the curriculum which they are able to incorporate into their teaching. They expand their awareness of students and their learning needs. They integrate feedback from peers and students into their teaching and assessment practices.”

(Alverno College, 1994)

New requirements for the submission of evidence about teaching

24. Compared with the quality and clarity of evidence lecturers submit about their research, evidence about teaching can look flimsy and unconvincing. To improve the quality of evidence submitted, many institutions provide guidance about what a 'teaching portfolio' may contain or even specify the contents of such a portfolio. Guidance is likely to emphasise:

- collection of evidence over an extended period of time rather than only the last year or two
- collection of evidence from a range of sources (e.g. colleagues, independent reviewers, external examiners, graduates, employers) rather than only students
- evidence from a range of courses, or about a range of teaching methods, rather than only about a small sample
- quantitative evidence from a reliable student feedback questionnaire, with norms that allow comparison, rather than only from a 'home made' questionnaire that makes interpretation of ratings difficult
- evidence of student performance rather than only of student views (for example evidence that retention, average marks or employability improved after an innovation)
- explanation of the significance of the evidence, perhaps in the form of a fully articulated personal rationale for teaching
- evidence of awareness, and use of, educational theory, literature, empirical evidence or good practice elsewhere, to demonstrate a level of scholarship of teaching
- evidence of efforts to develop teaching over an extended period (e.g. involving innovations, use of teaching development grants, development of new courses, staff development, writing of articles about teaching, involvement in national teaching development efforts within one's discipline)
- evidence of peer recognition of teaching excellence within a scholarly community.

Teaching portfolios can become bulky and difficult for promotions panels to read and interpret and it may be appropriate for such evidence to be judged by expert reviewers prior to consideration by the promotions panel.

25. If an experienced teacher is suddenly asked to produce such a portfolio of evidence without having collected it over an extended period of time they will have considerable difficulty. New teachers who have experienced initial training programmes accredited by the ILT are likely to have collected, interpreted, selected and presented evidence for assessment and accreditation purposes and will be in a better position to build up a convincing portfolio over time. Some institutions use their initial training in part to help teachers to develop the kind of portfolio that will be used for tenure decisions or for later promotion.

26. The kind of portfolio developed to demonstrate basic competence, for accreditation purposes, may well not provide the kind of evidence required to indicate that teaching is outstanding. At the University of Lancaster, published guidance on the preparation of teaching portfolios in the context of an initial training programme had to be supplemented by additional, and different, guidance for those seeking promotion to Senior Lecturer and different requirements again for Professorships. <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/users/personnel/critic.htm>

Peer review of teaching prior to consideration of evidence by a promotions panel

27. Evidence about research (such as journal articles, conference papers and research grants) has almost always been judged by expert peer reviewers long before the promotions panel sees it. In fact panels rarely see the evidence itself (such as articles or grant proposals), but only the outcome of peer review having already taken place (such as journal references and grant income). It is this prior peer review that gives the evidence credibility. It is the lack of equivalent prior peer review by informed experts that makes teaching portfolios so difficult to handle and the evidence so unconvincing and difficult to judge. While no equivalent ready-made community of peer reviewers exists for teaching,

some kind of peer review seems essential. In some systems only the peer reviewers see applicants' raw evidence about teaching and the panel only see the outcomes of that review – perhaps in the form of ratings. A system like this at the Western Australia Institute of Technology (now Curtin University) proved so effective at influencing promotion decisions to take teaching seriously, that a similar peer review and rating system for research had to be instituted to redress the balance back towards research again! Reviewers may be invited to observe teaching, see the applicant's teaching materials or interview the applicant, before making a judgement and passing this to the panel. Peer reviewers can be nominated by the applicant and a sub-set of the nominees selected by the Head of Department. Applicants may need to select external and credible reviewers, and educational development experts, if they want these peer reviews to be taken seriously. Institutions may wish to develop a panel of trained reviewers or at least to provide clear guidance concerning their role.

Development of the judgement of members of the promotions panel

28. Members of promotions panels often achieve their status and seniority by being excellent researchers or managers rather than by being excellent teachers. Even excellent teachers may not be well informed about judging teaching excellence. For example panel members may be in favour of use of methods similar to their own or similar to those commonly in use when they last taught regularly. At the University of Syracuse guidance and training for teachers on how to submit evidence, in support of an application for promotion on the grounds of teaching excellence, had to be followed very shortly afterwards by guidance and training for promotion panels on how to judge that evidence (Diamond, 1994). Panels may benefit from an exercise rather like a student assignment marking exercise, in which the panel members independently review, judge and discuss two or three rather different teaching portfolios and agree on the way they will use the criteria and on the kinds of evidence considered valid.

Mechanisms for balancing the weight placed on excellence in teaching and research

29. Even clear criteria, well assembled evidence about teaching and well informed and consistent promotions panels may not lead to the promotion of excellent teachers if panels have to weigh teaching against research. Research has greater, culturally ascribed 'value density' than teaching and evidence about research is easier to make judgements about. Faced with pressures from the Research Assessment Exercise, and tough competition for promotion, research strengths commonly win out. It is often necessary to introduce a mechanism that balances consideration of teaching and research. These may involve:

- quantitative ratings of teaching, research and administration that are simply added, with equal weightings, to avoid subjective bias towards research
- similar ratings, multiplied by the proportion of time the applicant spends on each activity, as agreed in their workload planning (see box below)

Judging how good lecturers are in their role

In this example, based on an American university, two applicants for promotion have different agreed workload allocations in terms of the percentage of their time spent on teaching, research and service. Applicant A has been allocated 70% of her time for research while Applicant B has been allocated 70% of her time for teaching. These allocations, multiplied by peer ratings (scored out of 5) of their performance in each area, produce overall indicators of their performance that are used to make pay and tenure decisions. In this system the better research record of Applicant A does not outweigh the better teaching record of Applicant B.

Applicant	Teaching			Research			Service			Total
	%	Rating	Score	%	Rating	Score	%	Rating	Score	Score
A	20	x3	=60	70	x4	=280	10	x3	=30	370
B	70	x5	=350	10	x2	=20	20	x3	=60	430

- parallel routes to promotion, or quotas, so that teachers are not competing with researchers
- specified levels of competence in teaching, research and service, so that it is explicit that excellence at research is not required if excellence at teaching is achieved. The example in the box below, based on an Australian institution, also distinguishes different levels of achievement for each of three areas of performance, different combinations of which are required for different levels of promotion.

Criteria at different levels for different promotions

In this example based on an Australian university, academics may choose which combinations of teaching, research and service to emphasise in their career, and must demonstrate defined levels in each in the combinations specified in this table.

	Teaching		Research		Service
Tenure	Competence	+	Competence	+	Competence
Assistant Professor	Competence	+	Excellence	+	Excellence
	or Excellence	+	Competence	+	Excellence
	or Excellence	+	Excellence	+	Competence
Professor	Leadership	+	Excellence	+	Excellence
	or Excellence	+	Leadership	+	Excellence
	or Excellence	+	Excellence	+	Leadership

Each level of competence, excellence and leadership is clearly defined for each of the three areas of performance. Note that in this model no promotion is possible to Professorship without excellence in teaching.

Requiring evidence concerning teaching for all promotions

30. One way of recognising teaching, even in research-oriented cultures, is to make teaching competence required for all levels of promotion. Some institutions have made completion of a Postgraduate Certificate in Teaching in Higher Education a requirement for probation. Some institutions have made membership of the ILT, with its defined minimum standard, required for all promotion decisions, right up to Professor. In the above example excellence in teaching is required for a Professorship, even when a higher level of achievement in leadership, is required for research.

Reward through increased pay

31. Many institutions already have annual opportunities for individuals' performance to be reviewed against agreed objectives, and for special achievements to be rewarded with either special financial awards for a single year, or additional increments that are permanent. For example, the Open University has a 'Career Development and Appraisal Scheme' (CDSA) that involves structured review against plans developed through discussion with a line manager the previous year. Following a CDSA review individuals can be nominated for awards or increments or can nominate themselves if they have not been nominated by others. Each faculty or unit has a proportion of its salary budget set aside for such additional salary costs. Teaching, teaching-related and support staff all experience the same kind of review and also the same kind of increased salary opportunities. There is no specification of what kind of achievements or additional responsibilities deserve such additional salary and teaching achievements can be rewarded as well as other kinds of achievements. Such rewards are usually:

- confidential, with no opportunity for celebrating excellence publicly. Only the individual who receives an award knows what it is for and others do not know what achievements have been rewarded

- made at the discretion of the local line manager on the basis of private information rather than, for example, a teaching portfolio or other evidence to back a claim
- for past achievement rather than future effort.

Reward through creating teaching-oriented career paths

Parallel teaching and research career paths

32. It is possible to develop parallel career paths for teaching and research, with equivalent titles and pay, where lecturers can choose which route to go down. In Holland some universities developed a system in which there was a teaching route, a research route and a combined route. Each route had four levels with well defined requirements which, once they had been met, triggered automatic promotion rather than there being an annual competition – in effect a competency based scheme. Academics could move from the research or teaching routes to the combined route, or from the combined route to either specialism, fairly readily, but it was very difficult to move from the teaching to the research route (or vice versa) because the requirements were so different.

New teaching-oriented senior positions

33. Increasingly institutions are establishing senior positions concerned exclusively with teaching so that those who devote their career to teaching need not reach a glass ceiling. The most common of these is a 'Readership in Teaching' – a position equivalent to a Readership awarded for research excellence. Readerships in Teaching commonly emphasise achievements involving the scholarship of teaching and pedagogic research rather than simply outstanding teaching. Such scholarship is still not very common and, where it takes place, is not always of a high standard compared with disciplinary research. As a consequence some schemes have had difficulty making awards as few people feel able to apply and those that do may not meet the required standard. In some cases MA programmes in Teaching in Higher Education have been developed, or postgraduate qualifications in educational research methods undertaken through action research, in order to develop the pedagogic research capacity to meet the required standard. It will probably be wise not to push Readership in Teaching too hard, too quickly, for fear of establishing a standard early on that might undermine its credibility in the longer term.

Senior teaching positions at the University of East London

At the University of East London there is an additional position equivalent to a Reader (and on the same salary scale as a Principal Lecturer) for those who are leaders in curriculum development, teaching innovation and the scholarship of learning and teaching. The title awarded is 'Readership in Educational Development in (the subject area)'. An individual may approach the Head of the Educational Development Service about applying for such a title and if a prima facie case is established, in relation to explicit criteria, then a mentor is allocated to advise on the construction of a portfolio of evidence. The portfolio is reviewed by three peers, one nominated by the applicant, one by the Head of School and one by the Head of the Educational Development Service. If this panel of peer reviewers is satisfied then the applicant presents a case orally to a panel chaired by the Vice Chancellor, membership of which contains an external representative. The panel also considers a report from the peer reviewers. To date eight Readers in Educational Development have been appointed. Readership holders are expected to take a leadership role in their subject area to promote learning and teaching.

A Teaching Fellow scheme is also in operation. Staff in receipt of teaching development project funds also receive a personal one-off award of £500 and the honorary title of Teaching Fellow. The university's nominations to the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme are drawn from the Readers and Teaching Fellows.

For more details see: <http://matrix.uel.ac.uk/eds/research/index.htm>

It is also becoming much more common, even in research oriented environments, for a professorship to be awarded where the primary achievements concern the development of teaching, albeit involving pedagogic research, and national and international reputations in the teaching of the discipline, rather than disciplinary research. A number of project directors of successful national scale projects supported by the Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning have since become Professors. Usually a level of disciplinary research achievement is required, but a much lower level than would normally be expected. As national efforts to improve teaching develop, internal and external funding opportunities expand, conferences and journals concerning teaching proliferate, and disciplinary communities develop through the Learning and Teaching Support Network (LTSN) Subject Centres, there will be many more opportunities for outstanding teachers to build a national and scholarly profile to a degree that justifies such professorships.

Recognition and increased status through awards and titles

34. Academics are not motivated primarily by money and often work tirelessly for things they believe in, and for recognition by their colleagues of their efforts. Mechanisms which involve public acknowledgement and status can be both effective and economical ways to recognise excellent teachers.

Teaching prizes and awards

Internal award schemes

35. By the early 1990s 70% of US higher education institutions had some kind of teaching award scheme and the UK is beginning to emulate this trend. The University of Ulster was probably the first UK institution to operate such a scheme successfully and now there are many variations. The most common features are:

- clear criteria and specification for the form of application and evidence
- one-off awards made annually
- public presentation of awards at a high profile event
- modest one-off financial awards
- awards in the form of grants for projects
- titles carried for one year
- teams applying as well as individuals
- nominations from departments that engage departments in discussion about criteria and encourage the local recognition of achievements
- nominations from amongst those awarded for the ILT's National Teaching Fellowship Scheme.

Criteria from the City University Teaching Awards Scheme

City University's judgements of applications for their 'Teaching Awards Scheme' are concerned with:

- "the ways in which the application demonstrates the applicant's ability to influence students positively, to inspire students and to enable students to achieve specific learning outcomes as defined by the institution and/or the subject area. (This relates to their own students and/or others in the field)
- the ways in which the application demonstrates the applicant's ability to influence and inspire colleagues in their teaching, learning and assessment practice, by example and/or through the dissemination of good practice

- the applicant's track record or potential, as demonstrated through the application, to influence positively the wider community of teachers and learners in higher education in relation to teaching, learning and assessment practice
- the applicant's ability, as evident in the application to demonstrate a reflective approach to teaching/the support of learning.

Characteristics of excellent teaching

The list of characteristics set out below have been recognised by the NTFS and may be considered to be indicative of excellence but are not intended as a comprehensive checklist. An applicant would not be expected to demonstrate all these characteristics. Equal weighting is not implied. Other characteristics which describe the applicant's excellence/innovation in teaching and/or the support of learning should be cited by the applicant as appropriate.

An excellent teacher:

- makes a recognised contribution to the learning, teaching and assessment of the subject
- incorporates sound subject knowledge, which is regularly updated in teaching, learning and assessment activities
- uses techniques and approaches for learning, teaching and assessment which are 'fit for purpose' and appropriate for the context and mission of the university
- plans, manages and delivers curriculum effectively
- demonstrates creativity and innovation in the design and planning of learning activities
- demonstrates understanding of how students learn
- evaluates innovative approaches to learning and teaching and adopts those of value
- establishes explicit learning outcomes for student learning
- demonstrates excellence in assessment design and/or implementation, including the use of formative feedback to foster student learning
- promotes high student achievement
- recognises student diversity and devises strategies to work effectively with students with diverse characteristics
- engages/enthuses/inspires students
- promotes interactivity rather than passivity in classroom activity, in independent/ distance learning or other contexts
- fosters student-centredness in their approaches to learning and teaching
- demonstrates genuine interest in students
- has excellent communication skills
- is sympathetic and effective in the support of students
- is accessible and approachable
- achieves added value/high retention rates with disadvantaged students
- fosters student development and independence
- is able to relate to students on programmes at different levels
- evaluates own performance against stated outcomes
- demonstrates commitment to scholarship in learning and teaching
- publishes on learning and teaching
- champions learning and teaching in the university
- shares and promotes good practice
- supports and collaborates with colleagues
- recognises, evaluates and adopts innovative approaches where these enhance learning

- offers and receives peer feedback on own teaching/assessment practice and uses it to enhance student learning
- makes active use of student feedback to influence the development of practice
- is reflective about personal teaching, learning and assessment practices
- demonstrates commitment to personal/professional development.

Adapted from: National Teaching Fellowships Scheme Judging Mechanisms, (<http://ntfs.itl.ac.uk/criteria.htm>).

Awards linked to the ILT National Teaching Fellowship Scheme

36. The National Teaching Fellowship Scheme has galvanised many institutions that previously had no organised way of nominating individuals to go forward to the national scheme. In-house schemes have often been set up so as to be able to identify and nominate someone for the national scheme. This has led to wide discussion of criteria and much localised discussion of who to nominate to the institutional scheme, and why. The impact on institutional recognition may be the most important consequence of the national scheme.

Subject specific awards

37. As in the US and Canada some schemes involve student nominations and also, occasionally, a range of awards for specific purposes sponsored and even organised by various different groups (e.g. the 'Bloggs plc Award for Innovative Accountancy Teaching', or the 'Student Chemistry Society Award for the best Teaching Assistant'). In some institutions individual Faculties or Schools operate their own awards.

Titles

Teaching Fellowships associated with teaching development roles

38. Napier University funds about 50 'Teaching Fellows' at any one time. These Teaching Fellows allocate a proportion of their time to teaching development activities. Fellowships are awarded on the basis of evidence of having undertaken development work that contributes to the implementation of the institution's learning and teaching strategy (for example setting up a life-long learning initiative) rather than on grounds of teaching excellence.

<http://www.eds.napier.ac.uk/eddev/fellows.htm>

39. The titles are often 'free' to the institution but give some additional status and incentive to the individuals involved. Having been awarded, such titles may contribute to a teachers' portfolio when they later apply for promotion. As with research, with teaching it is the accumulation of a variety of achievements and honours that eventually produces a credible case for promotion.

40. Criteria for the award of such titles may involve the potential of the individual to contribute to innovation and change, and to influence colleagues, through their project, rather than simply teaching excellence. Indeed someone may be able to run an effective project without being an outstanding teacher and some outstanding teachers may make poor 'change agents'.

Readerships and Professorships without pay increases

41. In institutions where there are 'Readerships in Teaching' this may not involve any increase in salary if the individuals involved are already on the same salary scale (for example as Principle Lecturers). The recognition and status of a Readership may be sufficient incentive and reward.

42. In some institutions a Professorship is awarded as a title, in part for teaching excellence, without there being any change in terms and conditions or in salary. At Oxford Brookes University, for example, many Professors have held Principal Lecturer posts. The status of having the title of Professor may be sufficient incentive for teachers to go to considerable lengths to lead the development of teaching in their discipline and undertake pedagogic research of internationally recognised standard. This may allow an institution to award more Professorships as there is no financial implication. However it may cause longer term difficulties in retaining Professors whose salary falls behind that of Professors in other institutions. Oxford Brookes University is currently introducing different types of Professorship, in part to get over this problem.

Recognition through new teaching related roles

43. Traditional approaches to rewarding excellent teaching have emphasised individual's past performance and generic notions of excellence. Increasingly institutions have strategic goals and have definitions of teaching excellence that relate to missions and learning and teaching strategies. Instead of wishing simply to orient academics towards teaching excellence they would rather orient academics towards the achievement of institutional goals and to use limited funds to support future activity that helps the institution to achieve these goals. They are looking for leadership of change and looking forwards rather than recognising excellence and looking backwards. This may involve recognition, including titles and salary, that is primarily an inducement to take up teaching development roles. It may be the same excellent teachers who in the main take up these roles or it may be rather different kinds of teacher who are keen to work with and support others rather than only to plough their own furrow.

Teaching development roles

44. The implementation of institutional Learning and Teaching Strategies has often involved the appointment of Departmental or Faculty 'Teaching Co-ordinators' who are not course leaders or quality managers but local educational developers, responsible for implementing strategic efforts to develop teaching at a local level. They may be allocated additional salary or awarded a temporary promotion (e.g. to a Principal Lectureship) to encourage them to perform this role and recognise its importance. It is an acknowledgement of the individuals' suitability to lead colleagues but not necessarily a recognition of excellence in teaching. It does, however, signal the seriousness with which the development of teaching is taken and give status to the individuals involved. Those holding these positions may be gathered together to form highly visible cross-institution teaching improvement teams, as at the University of Wolverhampton, and this also ascribes status and recognises the particular contribution these individuals are making. Taking part in such teams and having an institution-wide role can be very rewarding in itself.

45. There is evidence that such posts funded through the HEFCE's Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund are being 'mainstreamed' and built into departments' staffing structures and budgets. It is too early to tell whether taking up such roles brings career advantages or disadvantages to those involved in research-oriented departments.

Recognition of teaching development activity in duty allocations

46. Those taking on teaching development functions may be relieved of other duties (including teaching) as a recognition of their efforts. In some contexts (e.g. some departments at Imperial College London) developing a new course is rewarded by the teaching hours allocated on a lecturer's timetable in the first year of its operation being multiplied by up to a factor of six for the purposes of calculating an individuals' workload. This is to recognise the hugely increased workload involved and to encourage individuals to engage in course development.

Funding for leadership of development projects

47. The title ‘Teaching Fellow’ or the term ‘Teaching Award’ is also widely used to refer to lecturers who have been funded to undertake a teaching development project. The majority of institutions now have some kind of fund to support innovation in teaching and learning. Many such funds existed before TQEF funding became available, but have been extended and given a higher profile through learning and teaching strategies. Instead of simply operating as project funding mechanisms, such innovations funds have been used to give status and visibility to those involved. The University of East London, for example, added the title of Teaching Fellow, together with a personal one-off pay award of £500, to those running projects under a teaching development fund entitled ‘QUILT’ which had been running since 1994. At Anglia Polytechnic University those running projects are awarded titles and additional benefits. Some schemes resemble the ILT’s National Teaching Fellowship Scheme in that there is an element of recognition of excellence and also a project element. In many schemes the boundaries of reward and innovation schemes are hard to draw. Common features of such schemes, in terms of recognition and reward, include:

- the title being temporary, for the duration of funding of the innovation project
- the award being made publicly and with some ceremony, instead of privately by memo
- the funding being for new development and future activity rather than (only) for past achievement
- criteria being concerned more with the potential of the project to achieve worthwhile change of a kind congruent with the institutional learning and teaching strategy, rather than with individual excellence
- award holders being brought together to provide support for the innovation projects, to maximise dissemination and to develop the capacity of those involved to bring about change in teaching
- additional financial benefit to the award holder beyond the cost of undertaking the project
- additional support, such as administrative and research support, being made available to award holders to make it easier and more rewarding to undertake their projects
- widespread dissemination of the outcome of projects. This contrasts with reward schemes where it is much harder to disseminate anything, as what has been rewarded is often evidence of commitment and a range of practice over a period of time rather than a discrete innovation.

A parallel good practice guide (Gibbs, Holmes and Segal, 2002) provides case studies and analysis of the operation of such innovation funds and also of mechanisms to maximise the take up and embedding of innovations developed through such funds.

Membership of institution-wide development teams

48. Where learning and teaching strategies are organised around a number of key themes (such as assessment, retention, key skills or employability) award holders may be expected to contribute to a cross institutional task group addressing one of these themes that relates to their particular area of expertise or excellence. This may work best where the award holder is undertaking a funded project rather than where the award is for past excellence as the task groups tend to be action oriented.

Membership of ‘Teaching Academies’

49. In some US institutions all those given awards for conspicuous achievement in teaching are elected to a ‘Teaching Academy’ for life, even if they leave the institution. This Academy, containing all past award winners, is provided with funds to allow it to meet and to organise teaching events, and its expertise is utilised when the institution is developing policy and practice concerning teaching. The Academy serves a useful function. In England several institutions give ‘Teaching Fellows’ or teaching award holders roles and a special status – on Faculty Teaching Committees, on cross-university teaching development task groups, and so on, again making use of their expertise and at the same time recognising their special status. The establishment of a ‘Teaching Academy’ is a deliberate attempt to ascribe status, and give influence, to outstanding teachers.

Recognition and reward for teaching-related staff

50. A small number of institutions allow academic-related staff such as librarians, student counsellors, staff developers and computer support staff, to be recognised and rewarded if they have made a special contribution to teaching, for example through leading a successful teaching development project, or through running successful study skills programmes. They may be able to achieve the title of 'Teaching Fellow' with any accompanying salary, funds and status, without changing their substantive position or conditions of service. They may also be allowed to apply for 'innovation funds', to be seconded to the educational development unit in order to undertake a project, or to present sessions at annual teaching conferences.

Teaching Awards at the Open University

Along with a number of other institutions the Open University's Teaching Award Scheme is open to teaching-related staff but, unusually, it is also open to non-teaching staff. In the 2001 round of awards the majority of all the awards were allocated to teams of staff, rather than individually, and some of these teams were quite large and included all categories of staff. Those receiving awards included student support and library staff teams in which there were no academics. The sums of money awarded are small and are to undertake a modest project rather than to benefit the individuals involved. However the awards have quickly achieved some status. The number and quality of applications has increased and the awards event has become an established addition to the calendar, with the Vice Chancellor making a point of honouring in public the contributions of all categories of staff who support student learning in exceptional ways. The criteria for these awards relate closely to the university's mission. The university's nomination for the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme is drawn from those in receipt of internal teaching awards, though this rules out teams from being put forward.

<http://intranet.open.ac.uk/pvcsg/teaching-awards/intro.htm>

No examples were identified of schemes specifically for teaching-related staff and in general recognising the contributions of teaching-related staff to teaching is not yet widely developed.

References

- Alverno College (1994) *The Alverno College Handbook*. Milwaukee: Alverno College Institute.
- Diamond, R.M. (1994) *Serving on promotion and tenure committees*. Bolton: Anker.
- Gibbs, G. (1995) How can promoting excellent teachers promote excellent teaching? *Innovations in Education and Training International*. 32, 1, pp74-84
- Gibbs, G, Holmes, A & Segal, R. (2002) *Funding innovation and embedding new teaching practices*. National Co-ordination Team for the Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- HEFCE (1999a) *Teaching Quality Enhancement Fund. Circular 99/48*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council.
- HEFCE (1999b) *Institutional learning and teaching strategies. Circular 99/55*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council.
- HEFCE (2002) *Rewarding and developing staff in Higher Education Circular 02/14*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council.
- HEFCE (2001). *Analysis of strategies for learning and teaching. Circular 01/37a*. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council.
- Lublin, J. & Prosser, M. (1994) *Implications of recent research on student learning for institutional practices of evaluation of teaching*. In G.Gibbs (Ed.) *Improving student learning: theory and practice*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff Development.
- Macdonald, L. (1998) *Points mean prizes: reflections on awards for teaching excellence*. *Innovations in Education and Training International*, 35,2, pp130-132.

Section two:

Case studies of institutional systems that recognise and reward excellent teachers

51. These case studies are not simply about the details of how recognition and reward schemes operate. Although schemes are outlined, the documentation and details associated with these schemes can be found at the web addresses listed at the end of each case. Rather the purpose is to set the schemes in the context of the institution's learning and teaching strategy, institutional goals and culture. The reward mechanisms described are not isolated measures but part of a range of inter-linking efforts designed to have an impact on teaching. Recognition and reward schemes work best when set in the context of other efforts. For example:

- it may be difficult to judge excellent teaching in order to reward it if the quality of teaching portfolios is low, but teachers' ability to develop useful portfolios can be greatly enhanced through their use during initial training programmes
- it may be difficult to reward leadership of change in teaching if there are few opportunities to exercise that leadership, such as funding for teaching improvement projects or cross-institution groups set up to move a particular teaching issue forwards
- it may be difficult to engage teachers in striving for excellence if the definition of excellence is ill-formed or unrelated to institutional values and goals.

A review of recognition and reward schemes in Australia concluded that implementing isolated reward schemes, without other teaching development initiatives, achieved little (Ramsden et al 1995).

Case study 1

A comprehensive 'Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme' linked to institutional goals

This case study combines a range of mechanisms for recognition, reward and support for innovation in teaching, all closely linked to the institutional learning and teaching strategy. It illustrates the interlocking and embedded nature of a comprehensive scheme and its difference from a narrowly focussed promotion mechanism.

Anglia Polytechnic University (APU) started, in 1998, to align its teaching development more appropriately to the University's strategic mission. They have organised their efforts around the concept of 'Active Learning'. New staff are oriented to this learning paradigm through an initial training programme accredited by the ILT, and staff development for experienced teachers is similarly oriented towards promoting active learning. This case study focuses on one component of their learning and teaching strategy: their 'Learning and Teaching Fellowship Scheme'.

The scheme is a mixture of teaching development project funding for individuals and individual rewards, with a range of support for those involved. Individuals, including staff from partner colleges involved in access schemes, can apply for three levels of Fellowships, awarded twice a year in a regular cycle, through open competition:

- three 'Principal Teaching Fellows' appointments are awarded each year, each lasting three years. These appointments carry with them promotion to Principal Lecturer, with the accompanying salary, and carry the title 'Vice Chancellor's Award for Teaching and the Support of Learning'.

The University's nominee for the ILT's National Teaching Fellowship Scheme normally becomes a Principal Teaching Fellow.

- six 'Senior Teaching Fellows' are awarded each year, each involving a three year half time secondment into the Learning and Teaching Unit
- up to ten Teaching Fellowships are awarded each year, each for one or two semesters initially, but renewable for up to 2 years, with grants of up to £5,000.

Funding is provided partly from the HEFCE TQEF institutional learning and teaching strategy funds and partly from APU itself. Fellowship holders may also receive support in a variety of forms:

- organised networking with other Teaching Fellows
- funding for materials to support projects
- research support so that projects are underpinned by scholarship and are properly evaluated
- administrative support.

A total of nine 'Teaching Advisors' (at Principal Lecturer (PL) level) have also been appointed, one in each School, to:

- support networking between those developing active learning approaches
- disseminate developments from across the institution within the School
- encourage and facilitate teaching innovations.

A School-funded permanent promotion to PL or Professorship is planned for one member of each school as a recognition and reward for promoting active learning. One such appointment had been made by the end of 2001.

Web links for further information

http://www.apu.ac.uk/ltu/archived_news.shtml

<http://www.apu.ac.uk/ltu/strat.shtml>

<http://www.apu.ac.uk/ltu/news.shtml/learn>

Case study 2

Recognising and rewarding excellent teaching in a research environment

Imperial College London, has a highly research-intensive culture and a highly devolved approach to learning and teaching. Different traditions and approaches have developed within each Department or School. Prior to the development of a Learning and Teaching Strategy and funding through the TQEF, Imperial College had been funding teaching projects under its 'Teaching Development Grant Initiative'. The addition of HEFCE funding has enabled a step change to take place in this process. The institutional learning and teaching strategy provides a framework within which Departments and Schools develop relevant practices for their discipline.

New initiatives to assist Imperial College to achieve its learning and teaching goals include:

- the creation of a Centre for Educational Development to act as a focus for research, dissemination of good practice, innovation and training in teaching and learning
- compulsory training for all probationary lecturers and Graduate Teaching Assistants
- support for staff who wish to seek membership of the ILT

- a variety of funding arrangements for individuals and teams to develop their educational expertise and educational research ability
- revival of an enhanced scheme to recognise excellence in teaching
- funded support for teaching development networks that are emerging in the institution.

This case study focuses on the College's 'Teaching Excellence Reward Scheme', including a new award for innovation, an extension of a 'Teaching Development Grant' scheme, and a 'Teaching Research Grant' scheme.

A Teaching Award Scheme was initiated in 1994 and financial awards, with no associated promotion or change in role or title, were made biannually. The scheme was reviewed and developed in 1999 with the support of TQEF funds, and now provides for a maximum of 20 'Awards for Excellence in Teaching', and a maximum of three more prestigious 'Teaching Fellowships', one of which carries the title of 'Teaching Fellowship for Innovation'. Each Fellow receives a personal financial award of £1,000 and the College's nominee for the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme is made from this group. Teaching Fellowships are presented as part of the College's degree ceremony in the Royal Albert Hall. These are 'prizes' for past excellence and involve no project element or future role.

In a research culture the awarding of grants for work to be undertaken is one of the most widely accepted indicators of research quality and status. To parallel this, 'Teaching Development Grants' have been awarded since 1996. They are designed to aid the introduction of development of educational innovations which departments are otherwise unable to fund. Some grants are for up to £5,000 while others are for up to £20,000. Projects are normally of one year duration. In addition a number of 'Teaching Research Grants' are supported through TQEF funds, and, in parallel with the international nature of research at Imperial College, are open to collaborating international institutional partners. In common with such schemes in other research-intensive institutions, these grants are larger than in contexts where external grants are less frequently won and where external grants are usually more modest in scale. Grants are often used to fund research assistants and support staff rather than to pay for the time of lecturers, who tend to supervise teaching projects, and supervise research into teaching, rather than to carry out development and research themselves.

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.ad.ic.ac.uk/icced>

<http://www.ad.ic.ac.uk/icced/TDGScheme0203.htm>

Case study 3

An institutional version of the National Teaching Fellowship Scheme

The National Teaching Fellowship Scheme administered by the Institute for Learning and Teaching involves both reward for demonstrable excellence in teaching, in the form of a title and national recognition, and substantial funding (£50,000) for the Fellowship holders. The grant is used to support their own personal teaching development project over a period of up to three years. Applications to this scheme therefore involve both a backward-looking summary of evidence of excellence and a forward looking proposal for a project of potential value to others. The University of Gloucestershire has developed its own internal version of the national scheme and one of their own Fellowship holders is nominated for the national scheme each year. The Gloucestershire 'Teaching Fellowships Scheme' is embedded in a wider learning and teaching strategy that includes the following components:

- an initial training programme involving an ILT accredited Postgraduate Certificate in Further and Higher Education, extended for existing staff and postgraduate teaching assistants
- support for at least 80 staff (25%) to gain ILT membership by 2002
- expansion of the programme of work undertaken by a 'Scholarship of Learning and Teaching' group to support pedagogic research
- an institutional focus on widening participation and improving the quality of students' learning experience.

The Gloucestershire Teaching Fellowship Scheme was introduced in March 2000 to recognise and reward excellence in teaching. It awards four Fellowships a year, one being allocated within each of the four Faculties. Teaching Fellows are awarded £10,000 to support the project proposed in their application. Teaching Fellows are expected to produce a project report on completion and to offer seminars for dissemination. The role of the Fellows is currently being developed to enable the University further to benefit from their experience and expertise. For example, each Faculty Teaching, Learning and Assessment Committee now includes one Teaching Fellow.

Details of the application process are circulated by the Head of the Centre for Learning and Teaching to all full and part-time members of academic staff each year. The application form consists of two sections, one requiring a claim for excellence and the other requiring a project proposal which would contribute to the improvement on student learning in the university. Applicants invited for interview are asked to bring with them evidence which supports their claims made in the first section. The interview panel consists of a Dean of Faculty, Head of School, a Course Leader and the Head of the Centre for Learning and Teaching. The first Fellowships were conferred in November 2000. There are four Fellowships a year for over three hundred staff and some excellent applications do not succeed. Constructive feedback is provided by the Centre for Learning and Teaching to unsuccessful applicants.

The scheme is intended to be a celebration of excellence and conferment of the Fellowships is included in the annual award ceremonies as a high profile event. The symbolism of the award is considered important. Academic staff take the issue of delivering high quality teaching and learning very seriously and the awards are seen as 'holding up a torch' for others to see. The scheme is considered to have made a noticeable difference, in a short time, to attitudes towards teaching and its status.

Case study 4

Central and Faculty reward schemes in a research environment

University College London's Strategy for Learning and Teaching involves the expectation that Faculties develop their own learning and teaching strategies and teaching development activities within the framework of the institutional strategy. It is also expected that faculties develop their own approach to rewarding excellence in teaching in addition to an institution-wide scheme. This case study summarises both a centrally run promotion scheme and a Faculty-run teaching awards scheme.

The institutional strategy includes the following action points:

- establishing a unified scheme of Faculty Teaching Awards
- reviewing the senior promotions procedure (monitoring the number of promotions made through teaching excellence)
- establishing and funding a network of Co-ordinators for Learning and Teaching
- supporting ILT membership with funding

- funding innovation projects
- establishing two additional staff in central units that support the use of C&IT and academic staff development.

The strategy does not set particular directions or agendas for teaching (unlike the emphasis on ‘active learning’ at APU, for example, see case study 1) but instead emphasises the different priorities of different disciplines and so sets general goals concerning excellence such as:

- “The achievement and maintenance of excellence in teaching and learning”
- “Steps to promote excellence in teaching and to encourage staff to review their approaches to teaching and learning, particularly in the context of the ILT.”

The recognition and reward scheme is not oriented to supporting future teaching development activity of a particular kind but to recognising existing excellence.

The recognition of teaching achievement in the promotion process is established College policy and the criteria for academic promotion reflect the value placed on excellence and, especially, on innovation in teaching. Promotion to Senior Lecturer may be based primarily on outstanding excellence and innovation in teaching and even for Readership promotions, evidence of excellence in teaching is taken into account. Promotion to Professor, traditionally primarily on the basis of outstanding research, may also be based on exceptionally innovative or creative contributions to teaching coupled with a satisfactory record of research.

Assessing the quality of teaching achievement is normally based on a continuous teaching record or portfolio which academic staff will have maintained throughout their careers. This record will also normally be required to inform a biennial review. It is the responsibility of the candidate for promotion to assemble and update this documented evidence and for it to record both competence and innovation in teaching. The complete portfolio must be made available to the candidate’s Head of Department and/or the Dean, depending on the promotion route being followed. A comprehensive set of guidelines for presenting a promotion case based on teaching achievement is available to all candidates, together with a clear outline of the procedure to be followed.

In addition a ‘Faculty Teaching Award’ scheme (supported with £50,000 over three years) stresses teaching innovation and pedagogic research. It is designed to develop innovation, to support cultural change, and to raise the profile of excellent teaching. Awards can be for individuals and for groups. Faculties are developing their own mechanisms to make these awards.

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.ucl.ac.uk/epd/tqef/>

http://www.ucl.ac.uk/epd/tltc/ltn_aims.tml

http://www.ucl.ac.uk/epd/ltc/ltn_teachresearch.html

Case study 5

A Teaching Fellowship Scheme that funds projects linked to institutional priorities

The key emphases of the University of Central England's Learning and Teaching Strategy are to focus on learning and the learner by encouraging active learning, and to raise the effectiveness of staff inputs into the learning process by increasing staff satisfaction and success in teaching. All of the strategy's component activities and schemes support these emphases. The Staff and Student Development Department (SSDD) co-ordinates all these activities and maintains the coherence of their rationales. For example the SSDD operates an ILT accredited programme, focussed on active learning, which a high proportion of current university academic staff have completed, including six Heads of Department, one of whom brought with them the entire departmental staff. The effect on the approach to teaching and overall culture of the institution of such a large proportion of staff having experienced the same programme, with a clear rationale which supports the strategy, should not be underestimated. This emphasises the importance of symbiosis between different elements of a learning and teaching strategy rather than treating reward as an isolated initiative managed by a different group than that which manages the implementation of other elements of the strategy.

The university's promotion system already rewarded excellence in teaching and there had already been a scheme in place, for nine years, to fund teaching innovation projects. There is an assumption that a good teacher is an innovative teacher. The additional component of the strategy focussed on here is the establishment of a 'Teaching Fellowship Scheme'. This has some features in common with the Anglia Polytechnic University Scheme (see case study 1) in that it both supports projects and rewards the individuals that carry them out.

The scheme is designed to:

- create opportunities for developments in learning and teaching, including the use of information and communication technology
- stimulate innovation
- link teaching with research, especially through pedagogic research.

It is a project based award scheme with a focus on practical outcomes for improving the quality of students' learning. Funding is primarily given to carry out a project, but the Fellowship scheme further provides teachers with both a personal financial reward and enhanced academic status. It is planned that there should be about twenty Teaching Fellows at any one time with about nine 'new starters' each year. Applications are encouraged from partner institutions and a Fellowship has been awarded to a teacher in a partner institution. Projects are supported by 'Learning and Teaching Project Co-ordinators'. The intention is to shift the development from the preserve of the lone innovator to attract wider departmental or institutional involvement and dissemination. One way in which this is achieved is through project presentations given by Teaching Fellows to the regular 'Learning and Teaching Forums' which are usually very well attended.

The documentation supporting the scheme is a model of its kind, with clear and explicit criteria stated in comprehensive guidelines which orient applicants to the values which underpin the educational character and mission of the university:

- enhancing the employability of graduates
- reaching out to the community
- encouraging staff satisfaction and success in teaching and learning
- monitoring students' satisfaction and success in learning.

The extent to which applications address this mission determines their success, unlike at University College London, for example, (see case study 4) where there is a generic definition of excellence. Other documentation informs applicants of the type of evidence to be presented on application, and offers a theoretical model (based on Kolb's experiential learning cycle) for the initiation, planning, and implementation of the project.

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.sdd.uce.ac.uk>

Case study 6

A Teaching Award scheme with a clear definition of teaching excellence

City University's learning and teaching strategy includes a range of components designed to "foster innovative, flexible, distinctive and effective approaches to curriculum development in teaching and learning". These include:

- a new Educational Development Centre headed by a new Professorial post
- a 'Teaching Grants Scheme' which allocates up to £5,000 per project for research into teaching and learning as part of a 'Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Programme'. Grant holders are allocated the title of 'Teaching Fellow' and liaise between departments and the Educational Development Centre. They function as facilitators for other parts of the EDC programme while sharing with others the experience they have gained from the pedagogic research they have carried out in their fellowship year
- linked courses and events, including internal, local, national and international conferences which are designed to support the scholarship of teaching
- a postgraduate programme for new teaching staff scheduled to be reviewed by ILT for accreditation in 2002
- a 'Teaching Awards Scheme'
- parallel faculty based teaching awards. For example, there are 'Business School Teaching Prizes' of £2,000, for one teacher on each of their three main programmes (undergraduate, MSc and MBA).

Up to seven Teaching Awards of £1,000 are allocated annually, on a competitive basis, to recognise quality in teaching and in learning support. Four categories of application are encouraged, for 'Teaching Excellence', 'Teaching Innovation', 'Curriculum Development' and 'Student Support'. Teams of staff may apply. Application forms, detailed criteria (based on ILT criteria, see page 11) and guidance concerning submission of evidence in support of applications, is all provided on the EDC website. The use of ILT based criteria is significant because the University's nomination for the ILT's National Teaching Fellowships comes from amongst the Teaching Award holders. Awards are made at a special ceremony by the Vice Chancellor.

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.city.ac.uk/edc/winners.htm>

<http://www.city.ac.uk/edc.sotl/htm>

<http://www.city.ac.uk/edc/tlf.htm>

Case study 7

An explicit attempt to change the culture and to balance rewards for teaching with those for research

It is unusual for institutions to be open about the realities of existing reward systems and to tackle them head on. The learning and teaching strategy of the University of Central Lancashire sets out “to develop a culture in which excellence in developing learning is recognised and rewarded at individual and team levels ... the university will, as a priority, raise the status, recognition and rewards for the learning and teaching role of staff to a level equivalent to that given to research”. Its learning and teaching strategy explicitly addresses the existing culture and sets out to change it, using the Human Resource Strategy to help achieve this. The following extracts from the Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategy highlight this goal:

“The university will:

- recognise excellence in relation to learning and teaching
- review the reward structure for staff in relation to learning and teaching excellence and will reward those staff who make an outstanding contribution to the enhancement of learning and teaching...
- establish mechanisms at department, faculty and institutional level to identify excellence in learning and teaching.”

The University has included learning and teaching criteria for the first time in its Academic Promotions Scheme to recognise and reward exceptional achievement by individual members of staff. Eleven such appointments to Principal Lecturer were made in the first year of operation of the strategy.

In addition the University has embarked on a range of initiatives that emphasise, support and recognise teaching:

- establishing a Learning Development Unit (LDU) to support academic staff in various ways
- setting up opportunities for the exchange of good practice
- initiating a ‘Learning Development Week’ involving the University and its partner colleges
- establishing a ‘Curriculum Innovation Fund’ to support innovation and the dissemination of good practice in teaching and learning. More than 40 proposals were received of which about a third have been funded either wholly or in part
- allocating £20,000 for the creation of Teaching Fellow posts in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002
- setting a goal for all academic staff in the University to gain ILT accreditation by 2004-2005, with support for accreditation and a Learning and Teaching Project Co-ordinator appointed to support this aspect of the University’s strategy.

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.uclan.ac.uk/ldu>

<http://www.uclan.ac.uk/learning/>

Case study 8

Excellence awards and teaching fellowships designed to support strategically targeted efforts to transform teaching

The Teaching and Learning Strategy of the University of Coventry focuses on three areas:

- comprehensive response to change (“responding flexibly to changes in demand and scope”, “responding effectively to the competitive environment”, “managing structural change”)
- cost effectiveness (“maintaining quality in the face of declining resources”, “promoting the effective use of resources”)
- placing greater emphasis in teaching (“raising the profile of teaching and learning”).

In support of this third focus the university has committed itself to “encourage and reward excellent teaching” and to “enhance the professionalism of staff and maintain morale”. Rewarding excellence in teaching is undertaken through three complementary schemes: broadened criteria for promotion, including for Readerships; a Teaching Excellence Awards scheme; and School-based Teaching Fellowships. It is these two mechanisms other than promotion that are the focus of this case study.

Teaching Excellence Awards

Submissions for these awards are invited from individual staff members or from teams on their own behalf. One award went to a team of 19 people. Subject Heads or Deans can also make submission on behalf of their staff. Student views must be part of the evidence in support of the submission. General criteria for submission are circulated widely and each year’s awards are expected to focus on areas of specific interest to the University which vary from year to year. For example, the three issues identified for the academic year 2001-2002 were:

- maintaining quality with efficiency
- the provision of appropriate support for a diverse student body
- innovative assessment.

Teaching Fellowships

Teaching Fellowships are School-based teaching development roles. They are half time fixed term Principal Lecturer positions for an initial period of three years, funded through the TQEF. One Teaching Fellow (TF) is appointed in each school and is drawn from the staff of the school. There are currently seven such appointments in place. Full details of the role, activities and responsibilities of Teaching Fellows, criteria, and required qualifications and experience are published on the web.

Teaching Fellows work primarily with their colleagues, and are responsible to the Dean of School, but also work in close collaboration with the Director of the Centre for Higher Education Development (CHED). They are supported in developing their own educational development skills and knowledge during the three years and encouraged to apply for a Readership in Teaching in appropriate cases. As well as their School based activities they work collaboratively across School boundaries on current teaching initiatives such as online assessment and student progress files.

Teaching Fellows have become part of a wider ‘Task Force’ which works across the university to implement the learning and teaching strategy. This group includes staff working on development projects and representatives from University support departments. The Task Force forms part of a

growing critical mass involved in the management of change in the University, which includes, for example, the fifty members of staff now on the University's Postgraduate teaching and learning programme.

Weblinks for more information

<http://www.coventry.ac.uk/structur/tlstrat.htm>

<http://www.ched.coventry.ac.uk/ched/index.htm>

<http://www.ched.coventry.ac.uk/ched/aboutched/staff.htm>

<http://www.ched.coventry.ac.uk/ched/aboutched/teachingfellows.htm>

<http://www.ched.coventry.ac.uk/ched/taskforce/index.htm.htm>

Case study 9

A Teaching Fellowship scheme involving both financial reward and a development role

The aim of Middlesex University's Strategy for Learning and Teaching, related directly to the University Mission, is to ensure an effective student-centred learning experience to meet the needs of current and future students. This is a long term expression of the strategic goal which is implemented through 'themes' which are drawn out of the University's Strategic Objectives and from ongoing debates within the University community. The 'Institutional Learning and Teaching Strategy 1999-2002' arose from a large-scale consultation exercise about the mission and future direction of the University. The 'themes' of the strategy are medium term goals subject to periodic review and revision according to changing circumstances and continuing consultation. In the present planning period the strategy is carried forward through three main themes:

- Theme 1: "Enhancement of the quality of learning, teaching and assessment"
- Theme 2: "Provision of support for, and understanding of, greater learner autonomy"
- Theme 3: "Support and encouragement of open and flexible approaches to learning".

Proposed actions in relation to Theme 1 include various measures involving training and support for staff, encouragement for ILT membership and accreditation, project funding and also to:

- "design a Teaching Fellowship Scheme recognising and rewarding excellent teachers; aiming to reward Teaching Fellows and to use them as a University resource to encourage good practice
- implement the Teaching Fellowship scheme, engaging Teaching Fellows in the Learning and Teaching Enhancement Team."

The Teaching Fellowship Scheme (TFS)

The aims of the scheme are:

- to reward both excellent teachers with individual fellowships, and to reward excellent teaching with team awards
- to signal the value the university places on teaching excellence
- to establish a group of active leaders of good practice
- to contribute to improving the quality of student learning.

Teaching Fellowships are awarded on the basis of evidence of outstanding practice in teaching, learning and assessment. Selection is made against clear criteria, and is defined and aligned as far as possible to avoid conflict with promotion policy in the university and National Teaching Fellowship nomination requirements. Up to six Teaching Fellows may be appointed each year. The scheme is distinctive in that it permits the award of a Fellowship to a teaching team of up to six

teachers. The tenure of the Fellowship is three years, allowing a maximum complement of 18 Fellows at any one time. Fellows each receive £3,000 per year for the period of the tenure. In the second year of the scheme existing Fellows will act as evaluators of the evidence supplied by new applicants who will then be interviewed by an internal panel which includes an external advisor and which makes the final decision regarding the awards. Individuals can retain the title after tenure and the award can be cited as grounds for promotion. National Teaching Fellowship nominees are chosen from among the Teaching Fellows.

2001 was the first year of the TFS and much time has been spent on raising awareness of learning and teaching issues at different levels. A balance had to be struck in the design of the TFS so that it met the need for rigour on the one hand, but was not so daunting that it put people off on the other. The VC attended the award evening and presented the awards. One of the Middlesex University Teaching Fellows was awarded a National Teaching Fellowship in 2001.

Future developments

At present staff attitudes lag behind the scheme. While there is a genuine sense of pride in achievement in the part of many staff there is also a reluctance to claim publicly that what they do is excellent, and this has limited the number of applications. A more public spotlight might draw them out in future especially as the successful applicants expressed great pleasure in receiving their awards. There will now be two application dates each year and prospective applicants may select when they want to apply.

The issue of rewarding non-teaching or learning support staff who support excellent teaching has been discussed, and a proposal is under consultation for a parallel scheme to recognise and reward these staff. Methods of involving students more in the nomination process are also under consideration.

Teaching Fellows have now been brought together with another group, the Learning and Teaching Strategy Implementation Team, to undertake tasks directed by the University's Learning and Teaching Strategy, using each other as resources. This is similar to Coventry University's use of Teaching Fellows in their 'Task Force' (see Case Study 8).

Weblinks for further information

<http://www.mdx.ac.uk/governance/docs/index.htm>

<http://www.mdx.ac.uk/governance/docs/ltsannexA.pdf>

<http://www.mdx.ac.uk/governance/docs/ltsannexB.pdf>

Section three:

Issues raised by mechanisms to recognise and reward excellent teachers

Competence, excellence and leadership

52. Early attempts to define teaching excellence often seemed to go little beyond definitions of professional competence in the classroom – standards that one might expect all experienced teachers to achieve rather than standards that were deserving of special recognition and reward. Attempts to set standards for higher levels of promotion then sometimes looked like ‘really excellent’ classroom teaching or even ‘absolutely outstanding’ classroom teaching. But when looking at an individual’s research excellence one might expect a hierarchy of standards that not only involved excellence in conducting basic tasks but excellence at new and more demanding tasks. For example one might look for:

- achievement of grants for larger scale research and for leadership of research teams, rather than just doing small scale research on one’s own
- editorship of journals rather than simply submitting papers to journals or reviewing articles
- serving on research councils rather than simply submitting bids to them
- organising international conferences rather than only presenting at them, and so on.

53. Similarly in teaching one might expect there to be a hierarchy in which at higher levels the act of teaching itself, and even excellence in teaching, is more or less taken for granted and one was looking for evidence of:

- leadership of the development of teaching in one’s colleagues and in courses in one’s department, rather than simply developing one’s own teaching
- contributions to moving the teaching of one’s discipline forward at national or international level, rather than only small scale, local efforts
- formal scholarship concerning teaching involving funded development or research, with published outcomes, rather than treating teaching as merely a craft.

This would avoid the potential problem of an individual repeatedly being rewarded or promoted simply for being good in the classroom.

Rewarding past performance vs orienting future efforts

54. Traditional schemes tend to look backwards – they are attempting to reward those individuals who have excelled in their teaching over perhaps many years but whose contribution to the institution has not been fully recognised. There might be no expectation that the individuals involved would contribute anything new in the future. Indeed such excellent teachers might be the wrong people to lead change or might even be excellent at patterns of teaching which the institution is trying to move away from – for example at lecturing. Excellent teachers may be charismatic or excellent in idiosyncratic ways and so do not provide a model others could easily imitate or even work towards. Such teachers might not be able to provide leadership of colleagues’ efforts to improve teaching.

55. In contrast recently developed schemes are more likely to use reward or recognition mechanisms to orient teachers to the future development of teaching. Individuals rewarded in this way might not

even be the best teachers but instead are those best suited to galvanising their colleagues and leading change, or are those most willing to put extra effort into changes of the kind the institution is prepared to support. Completely different schemes are likely to be required for these contrasting purposes and it might even be necessary to have both. This issue of whether the scheme looks backwards or forwards is central to what the institution gets out of investment of time and money in its reward schemes.

Generic definitions of teaching quality vs strategic goals

56. Early attempts to draft promotion criteria that define teaching quality, even if they drew on scholarly literature on teaching excellence, may have emphasised traditional patterns of pedagogy, and in particular readily recognisable forms of classroom performance. Now that institutions have learning and teaching strategies and are attempting to line up all mechanisms and policies behind institutional goals, this traditional focus is unlikely to be particularly helpful. What is necessary to support life-long learning, improved student retention, the development of students' transferable skills or accessible curricula for disabled students, is unlikely to be captured in generic definitions of teaching quality. Institutions need to decide what kind of teaching behaviour they want to reward. It may be more effective to take individuals' orientation to teaching excellence for granted as an attribute of any professional teacher, and to use reward mechanisms to orient teachers towards those additional competencies and commitments that are required in order to deliver institutional goals and which might otherwise not be especially valued or likely to be developed.

Permanent promotion vs temporary benefit

57. Traditional reward structures involve permanent promotions and accompanying permanent salary costs. These can block the system, especially in cases where there are no senior level posts available and there being insufficient salary budget to fund further reward. Such permanent promotions may reduce the scope for future opportunities for reward. Institutional priorities change rapidly and much of the benefit to the institution of an individual promotion might be achieved within a couple of years or there may indeed be no benefit. Indeed there is evidence in the US that teachers' ratings from students actually decline immediately after they gain tenure. It might be much more effective to provide short-term rewards – both in terms of titles and financial benefits – linked to current priorities. There would be nothing to stop individuals applying repeatedly for such rewards if they could show their continued excellence and commitment as well as their flexibility to respond to changing priorities.

Small number of staff with a large reward vs a large number of staff with a small reward

58. Some reward mechanisms are so expensive that institutions might be able to offer only a small number each year or, in small institutions, one every couple of years. But much of the benefit of recognition and reward might be achieved with much more modest schemes involving smaller sums. For example Napier University has been able to appoint nearly 50 'Teaching Fellows' because of the modest costs per individual involved. This is likely to have had much more impact on the development of teaching, and the achievement of the goals of their learning and teaching strategy, than a small number of expensive promotions.

Rewarding individual excellence vs rewarding collaboration

59. It is becoming more common for modules and courses to be taught by 'course teams' rather than by individuals, with the whole team sharing responsibility for improvement and effectiveness, and the whole team engaging together in teaching development activities. For example, at the Open University all courses are both developed and delivered by course teams and these teams can be quite large. It is also becoming more common for innovation in a department to involve collaboration between a group, perhaps all introducing the same innovation, such as the introduction of 'First Class' computer conferencing with students, in parallel across a cluster of modules. Cross-university teams may be responsible for widespread change concerning a particular innovation, such as the use of peer tutoring at the University of Bournemouth. In such circumstances it may be inappropriate, or even invidious, for one individual to be rewarded while everyone else involved is not. Some institutions have devised schemes for the award of 'teaching fellowships' or special funding for projects, to teams as well as to individuals. Coventry University, for example, allocated a 'Teaching Excellence Award' to a team of 19 people. An emphasis on traditional promotion mechanisms for reward, which inevitably focus on the achievements of individuals, can make it difficult to encourage and recognise collaborative teaching excellence. Institutions should consider what changes in behaviour they wish their reward mechanisms to foster.

Peripheral short term changes or permanent changes to core roles and career paths

60. Traditional promotion mechanisms may change an individual's title (e.g. to Senior Lecturer) without in any way changing their role or pattern of activity, and this change in title will be permanent. Some schemes award a Principal Lectureship for a fixed term, perhaps three years, with no change in role. Others may require that the person temporarily promoted undertakes particular teaching-related responsibilities within this fixed period. 'Teaching Co-ordinator' roles and some 'Teaching Fellow' roles carry with them particular duties and the person involved may drop some teaching or administrative duties in order to be able to carry out these roles. Sometimes the adoption of a teaching development role of this kind carries with it an assumption that the individual has made a choice about their career path. A particular strength in their expertise has been identified and they will emphasise this in the future and orient themselves to leadership of the development of teaching rather than to, for example, leadership of research or the adoption of senior administrative roles. When devising recognition and reward schemes institutions may wish to consider the career path implications for those they reward. What do 'Teaching Fellows' do after their three year role is complete? In addition, while some schemes assume that the individual remains simply an excellent teacher, albeit one who might put extra effort and time into innovation, others allocate new roles that require new skills. Facilitating the teaching of others or fostering wide scale innovation involves quite different expertise than undertaking one's own teaching especially well. Institutions may wish to consider the training and support required to undertake such roles, and whether the selection procedures should take into account individual's suitability for such roles.

The roles of the department and the centre

61. In some institutions recognition and reward schemes are run centrally and in others they are run at Faculty or even Department level. In a few there are both central and Departmental schemes. It is possible for Departments to develop sophisticated and fair systems that reward teaching, and local

judgements made by those who understand the teaching context may be more sound than those made by judges distant from the context. However department-level schemes face a number of difficulties:

- it is more likely for overwhelming local priorities (such as the need to retain a particular star researcher or the need to fill a demanding administrative role) to overpower concerns for excellence in teaching. There have been examples of recognition of teaching almost disappearing once a scheme had been devolved to departments
- it is more likely that promotion positions will already have been filled and that there is a ‘log-jam’ preventing further promotion. Such jams can last many years
- it can be socially uncomfortable to put oneself forward as better than one’s immediate colleagues, and to be judged by one’s colleagues, particularly if one fails. A degree of social distance, gained by applying to a central scheme, can feel less difficult and can encourage more applications
- cases may be considered rather seldom, and with little or no competition, and so whoever makes judgements about teaching quality never develops any expertise or sense of comparative standards in the way that a central panel considering many cases would
- many central schemes provide central guidance for applicants concerning, for example, how to put a teaching portfolio or case together. This often involves confidential individual consultation by educational development staff. Any departmental scheme should consider how to provide a similar level of support.

Institutional size

62. It may be much harder to operate schemes that offer explicit formal recognition and reward for teaching in small institutions. The table below summarises some of the issues likely to be faced in comparison with large institutions.

Large institution	Small institution
Many opportunities for promotion each year	Few opportunities. ‘Log-jams’ and financial constraints often prevent promotion for several years at a time
Promotions may be awarded for research, teaching or administration	Many promotions used to fill administrative positions
Somewhat anonymous and private for applicants	Much more public – colleagues will know who has applied and succeeded
Judges can be neutral	Judges likely to be well known to applicants
Relatively easy to operate several schemes in parallel e.g. promotion, Teaching Fellowships and Teaching Awards	Difficult to operate complex schemes
Awards may be substantial	Awards likely to be modest
Educational development units and other sources of expertise available to design, develop and implement schemes	Often no special unit or expert staff

In small institutions recognition is more likely to come through the nature of the culture, informally and socially, and depend on the values expressed through leadership of teaching rather than on formal mechanisms.

Institutional cultures

63. In some institutions and departments gaining promotion on the basis of teaching excellence, or being given a teaching award, could have serious negative consequences for your career. It would be taken to indicate a lack of priority given to research. In some cases there are modest attempts to reward excellence in teaching at the same time that new teaching-only posts have been established with a lower salary, poorer conditions of service and no tenure. In some departments even applying for a teaching award, or claiming teaching excellence as part of an application emphasising research strengths, would raise serious doubts. In such contexts, simply changing promotion mechanisms, criteria or post titles is unlikely to achieve much without a fundamental change in values and culture. While rewards can play their part in such a cultural change it is likely also to involve:

- the gradual development of a 'community of practice' that discusses and reviews teaching in a more scholarly way, bringing to debates an intellectual rigour of a form that is valued
- clear leadership that consistently places value on teaching and on efforts to improve teaching
- an appointment process that avoids the hiring of staff who do not value teaching.

This would require commitment over an extended period.

Developing standards

64. When institutions have established new senior positions oriented to teaching excellence, such as Readerships in Teaching or even Professorships, criteria have been carefully drafted to be equivalent in some way to parallel positions oriented to research. They may require, for example, a record of scholarly publication concerned with the pedagogy of one's discipline that can be demonstrated to have had an international impact. Some institutions have then found that no-one comes close to meeting these criteria or even that no-one applies for the positions. The dilemma is then whether to lower the standard in order to get the scheme under way or to spend a little longer developing the standard of staff so that they are in a stronger position to apply. Institutions have, for example, established Masters programmes in teaching in higher education that build on Postgraduate Teaching Certificates for new lecturers. But no institution would promote a Lecturer to a Readership or Professorship simply for having a Masters in their discipline. It is clear that the standards are currently not equivalent. In fact now is a good time to get promoted via these new routes as the standards will presumably become markedly higher over time. This may be no different to what has happened to the standards associated with promotion (on the grounds of research excellence) to Principal Lecturer or Senior Lecturer between 25 years ago and today. The consequences of this shift in standards include the motivational effects on those young researchers who may have relatively unproductive but much more highly paid older colleagues who occupy all the available senior positions. It is important to have this long term perspective and not to rush the implementation of new schemes and then regret early promotion decisions at leisure.

Time scales

65. Some institutions have been trying to reward excellent teachers since the late 1970s and they are still trying to get it right. It can take time to:

- develop mechanisms that work
- develop teachers' sophistication as teachers so that they deserve promotion
- develop teachers' ability to collect and present convincing evidence about their teaching – this might follow a decade after the introduction of scholarly initial training
- develop promotions' panels' ability to make sound judgements about teaching excellence

- change the culture so that individuals perceive it to be in their career interests to pursue teaching excellence over an extended period.

Without such long term development, short term frustrations and reversals should be expected.

Supporting parallel mechanisms

66. Some institutions have many years of experience with a range of mechanisms associated with the improvement of teaching which provide a platform on which it is possible to build trustworthy and workable reward mechanisms. For example:

- peer observation of teaching, so that teachers are used to being judged and are used to making judgements, and so have informal benchmarks about the range of quality to be expected
- initial training assessed by teaching portfolios, so that teachers are used to documenting their teaching in rigorous ways
- student feedback mechanisms so that comparative data in the form of ratings can be used as evidence, for example for teaching awards
- students who, through discussion of teaching and learning and experience of a range of approaches to teaching, are more sophisticated as learners and who therefore make better judgements about teaching
- a lively community of practice that debates teaching issues so that judgements are more sophisticated and well informed
- appraisal that focuses in a rigorous way on teaching so that teachers have a good sense of their progress and of their readiness to apply for promotion, through a series of cycles of improvement.

Without experience of such parallel mechanisms it is likely to be much harder to establish recognition and reward schemes that operate well.

Encouraging the others

67. The harsh reality of most recognition and reward schemes is that most applicants do not get rewarded – they get rejected. A scheme that raised the aspirations of 50 people and then dashed the hopes of 48 might cause a lot of damage to teachers' motivation. When devising a scheme it might be more important to consider the potential impact on those not rewarded, and even on those who did not apply, than only considering the impact on those who are rewarded. This is another reason for considering mechanisms that allocate small rewards widely and frequently, with multiple opportunities for each individual, rather than awarding large rewards narrowly and seldom, with only one or two opportunities in an entire career.

Comparisons with rewarding excellence in research

68. It is often claimed that, compared with judging excellent researchers for promotion, judging excellence in teaching is simply too unreliable, or even inherently impossible. However judgements about researchers, or even reviews of research articles, are notoriously unreliable. The length of a publications list or the size of research income is used as a convenient substitute for any more sophisticated thinking about research excellence. In comparison even students' ratings of teachers, for example, can be highly reliable and even fairly valid. There are well established models of what good teaching consists of, accompanied by sensible measures that relate well to independent measures of impact such as student performance. There are also measures of teaching that are sensitive enough to be able to measure, for example, the impact of even quite short training on teachers performance and attributes. Measures of impact of research are, in comparison, poorly developed and are not usually used in making promotion decisions. It would not be difficult to establish mechanisms for judging

teaching excellence that stood up well to the kinds of critique one could easily apply to mechanisms for the judgement of research. The fact that these mechanisms for judging teaching are rarely used, does not justify the claim that judging research is easier.

69. The apparent credibility of publications and grants as an indicator of research quality comes from the fact that peer review has taken place prior to the judgement by the promotions panel. In comparison raw data about teaching (the equivalent of articles or even research data) is put in front of promotions panels with no prior peer review having taken place, and this inevitably causes problems as the panel is in no position to make sensible judgements about such raw data. To increase the credibility of cases about teaching excellence it is necessary to organise prior peer review of evidence by credible reviewers. The creation of a community of practice that is capable of making such credible peer review judgements about teaching may be a prerequisite to real progress in promotions panels feeling confident about their decisions.

Further reading

Alverno College (1994) **Alverno Educator's Handbook**. Milwaukee: Alverno College.

A staff guide to a comprehensive and detailed set of criteria and, uniquely, standards, for several levels of promotion in an institution where only teaching is valued. It provides a benchmark for what an explicit set of criteria and standards for teaching rewards could look like.

Anderson, E. (Ed.) (1993) **Campus use of the teaching portfolio. Twenty-five profiles**. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

A product of the 'Roles and Rewards' initiative in the USA, describing the way a wide variety of institutions use teaching portfolios to record and recognise teaching accomplishments.

Anwyl, J., Balla, M. & McInnis, C. (1991) **Recognition of teaching performance in promotion procedures**. Canberra: Department of Employment, Education and Training.

This Australian Government report is a detailed study of promotion procedures at the University of Melbourne. It is a good introduction to the issues involved in taking teaching into account to a greater extent within the structure of traditional promotion mechanisms.

Diamond, R.M. (1994) **Serving on promotion and tenure committees**. Bolton: Anker.

After changing promotion criteria and improving the quality of evidence teachers submitted, Syracuse University realised it needed to improve the quality of decision making by those on promotion panels if the teaching reward scheme was going to work. This is the result.

Edgerton, R., Hutchings, P. & Quinlan, K. (1991) **The teaching portfolio: capturing the scholarship in teaching**. Washington D.C.: American Association for Higher Education.

One of the more thoughtful, and less mechanical, publications on the development and use of teaching portfolios to document teaching accomplishments.

Gibbs, G. (1995) **Promoting excellent teaching is harder than you'd think**. Change. May/June, pp 16-20.

A commentary on the American Association for Higher Education's 'Roles and Reward' initiative in the USA. The article draws conclusions from established schemes to recognise and reward excellent teachers in a variety of other countries in order to highlight some of the difficulties American institutions will face.

Gibbs, G. (1995) **How can promoting excellent teachers promote excellent teaching?** Innovations in Education and Training International. 32, 1, pp 74-84

A questionnaire survey of promotion practices for excellent teachers in the UK and an analysis of the features of schemes that need to be addressed if they are to have an impact on institutional cultures and on the value placed on teaching, rather than simply on those who are promoted.

Gibbs, G. (1995) **Promoting excellent teachers at Oxford Brookes University: from profiles to peer review in ten years**. In R.P.T. Aylett and K.J. Gregory (Eds.) *The Teaching Profile for Individual Academics in Higher Education*. London: Taylor and Francis.

An account of attempts over an extended period to promote excellent teachers at one institution. The scheme outlined at the end of the article was not implemented once promotion decisions were devolved to departments, illustrating the difficulty of using promotion schemes alone to recognise and reward teaching.

Lynch, B. (2001) **Innovative teaching in a higher education establishment – how extraordinary?** *Journal of Further and Higher Education*. 25,2, pp 175-194

An analysis of what teaching awards at the University of Durham have been awarded for, raising questions about what is meant by ‘innovation’, and emphasising the need for clear criteria.

Ramsden, P., Margetson, D., Martin, E. & Clarke, S. (1995) **Recognising and rewarding good teaching in Australian higher education**. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.

This report was commissioned by the Australian Committee for the Advancement of University Teaching – a body that funded national scale teaching projects in a similar way to the Fund for the Development of Teaching and Learning in England. It is still the most comprehensive review of issues concerning recognition and reward. Based on a full survey and detailed analysis of issues concerning effectiveness of schemes, the conclusions in the report include:

- “articulate more explicit criteria and standards for good teaching for appointments, confirmation and promotion purposes
- establish minimum standards of teaching performance, linked to these criteria, for all levels of appointment and promotion
- broaden the base of evidence used to assess teaching and make more use of portfolios and peer assessment
- prepare committee members for their role as assessors of teaching more thoroughly
- help candidates learn how to describe and document their teaching achievements
- expect all newly appointed academic staff to become qualified as university teachers as a condition of confirmation or promotion
- build an academic environment in which it is pleasant to teach well and enjoyable to improve teaching
- acknowledge the crucial role of leadership in recognising and rewarding good teaching
- make senior appointments in teaching
- honour teaching and teaching achievement publicly.” (p. vii – viii)

It contains a very comprehensive bibliography.

Warren, R. & Plumb, E. (1999) **Survey of distinguished teacher award schemes in higher education**. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 23, 2, pp 245-255.

An analysis, undertaken through interviews and study of documentation, based on a selective survey of a range of award schemes, undertaken by University College London prior to establishing such a scheme within the College. The article highlights the most common features of schemes and distinguishes four types: ‘traditional’ award schemes, teaching fellowship schemes, educational grant schemes and promotion/bonus schemes.

TQEF National Co-ordination Team
Centre for Higher Education Practice
The Open University
Walton Hall
Milton Keynes
MK7 6AA

t: 01908 858434
f: 01908 858438
w: www.ncteam.ac.uk
e: ss-ncteam@open.ac.uk

