

**PRELIMINARY DRAFT OF
TEACHING CRITERIA, LEVELS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND POTENTIAL
EVIDENCE**

Prepared by the Parity of Esteem working group

Introductory comments:

1. We do not see the levels as corresponding to particular academic grades. Instead, we would like to see promotion cases put either in terms of depth or breadth of activity in order to allow staff to play to their strengths and to reflect differences in provision across the University. A case could then be made either on the basis of Level 2 achievement in a limited number of areas, Level 1 achievement in a broader range on areas or a mixture of Level 1 and Level 2 performance.
2. Though we are aiming for a system that supports transparency, there is no expectation that promotion could be done numerically, but in this sense teaching and learning is no different from research.
3. Achievement with respect to some criteria does not correlate with level of seniority. There is for instance no evidence within the University that the more senior the lecturer the higher the course unit evaluation score. In the main, expectations correlate more directly to level of seniority in areas relating to the management of teaching. Categories are not absolute in any of the criteria and examples are indicative of activity rather than definitive.
4. We assume that the same criteria will apply to all colleagues who have teaching as part of their contract, whether it is teaching focused or not. The expectations with respect to breadth and depth of achievement are likely to differ depending on the type of contract.
5. We have tried here to establish two different levels for each criterion, but we do not think all level 1 achievements contribute equally. For instance, having active involvement in curriculum development or receiving external teaching awards is a more impressive achievement than teaching with a majority of students being satisfied or very satisfied. It may then be more appropriate to have three levels, with some criteria matching levels 1 and 2 and others 2 and 3. However, it may be more appropriate to leave this judgement up to Faculties so that the context can be taken into account.
6. Each criterion needs to be adapted to the local context. For instance, if there is no opportunity to teach at postgraduate level, or no opportunity to teach large classes, then any criterion relating to breadth of teaching experience need not be applied.
7. Some criteria may be essential for some levels of promotion, for instance, promotion to SL may require at least Level 1 for Criterion 1. However, the group does not make any recommendations about necessary criterion at this stage.

8. By ‘internal reference’, we mean statements by HoD and HoS. It is essential that a colleague with direct knowledge of the applicant’s performance in a certain area, for instance the Director of Teaching and Learning, has an input to these statements.
9. The unit survey will play a role in evidencing the teaching performance where individual information is available. How big a contribution it makes to the overall case depends on return rate and total number of students who responded. It is therefore essential that detailed information about student numbers and return rates is provided as part of the CV.
10. The headings A, B and C may not be significant; they are used here mainly to try to ensure that all kinds of contribution are considered with no expectation that it is necessary to perform in all areas. In some cases, Level 2 performance under A or B is stated in terms of University-external achievement rather than listing a similar criterion separately under C.
11. We refer to ‘robust peer review’. Here we anticipate a more consistent peer review process than the one we currently have, possibly involving a University-wide group of peer reviewers as well as local representation, and the review involving not just the actual lecture, but also considering course unit design, learning materials and integration of strategically important areas into the curriculum (employability, internationalisation, social responsibility etc).¹
12. With respect to Criterion 1, comments on the context within which the unit is taught are appropriate (whether the course is obligatory, whether it is perceived to be formal/difficult by students etc).
13. For some criteria (for instance Criteria 3, 4 and 8), the evidence specified is the same for the two levels because the evidence relates to the outcome. The difference in levels is related to the role the individual played in the process.
14. With respect to Criterion 6, we do not anticipate that the lecturer needs to be research active themselves. Indeed, colleagues may well achieve Level 2 with respect to this criterion without having carried out the research themselves. We also do not think that it is something that can only be done in the final year of UG programmes and at PG level.
15. With respect to Criterion 9, as far as the group is aware, there are currently very limited University-internal opportunities for training and development in teaching and learning beyond the New Academic Programme, but we assume that this is something that will be developed.

¹ As a result of the group’s work, the chair met with representatives of all Faculties and of TLSO and a revised University framework for peer review has been drafted.

	Criterion	Level 1	Evidence	Level 2	Evidence
A.	A. Direct contribution to teaching, learning and student experience				
1.	Breadth of teaching experience: sizes of groups and levels taught	Limited range of levels and group sizes	Internal reference	Broad range of levels and group sizes	Internal reference
2.	Evaluation of teaching performance (including assessment and feedback)	Majority of students satisfied or higher in the unit survey (see 9 above); robust peer review identified no problems and some good practice	Unit survey results; reports from robust peer review; where appropriate and available other feedback from students	Overwhelming majority of students satisfied or higher in unit survey(see 9 above); robust peer review identified excellence	Unit survey results; reports from robust peer review; where appropriate and available other feedback from students; student nomination for teaching awards; specific comments made in staff-student liaison committees; programme-level feedback processes; comments made by external examiners
3.	Curriculum development	Active involvement in work to strengthen a programme, including elements to support integration of employability, internationalisation, social responsibility etc	Internal reference; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)	Leadership in work to strengthen a programme, including elements to support integration of employability, internationalisation, social responsibility etc	Internal reference; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)
4.	Course unit development and renewal (including content and methodologies for teaching and assessment)	Revision to improve course units (e.g. renewing content; revising assessment; renewing online provision; reacting to changes in accrediting bodies or student cohort)	Internal reference; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)	Development of new course units to strengthen a programme or major revision to existing course unit (introducing new assessment, drastically improving online provision etc)	Internal reference; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)

5.	Engaging with students	Academic advising role (or similar student supporting role) carried out competently; support for existing student peer activity; support for established student societies	Evidence of general student satisfaction with advising role through questionnaire (where used to assess academic advising); internal reference possibly with input from students	Academic advising role (or similar student supporting role) carried out in an outstanding way; involvement in developing student peer activity; initiative to new forms of student engagement	Evidence of excellent student satisfaction with advising role through questionnaire (where used to assess academic advising); internal reference possibly with input from students; evidence of new initiatives and their impact
6.	Integrating discipline-specific research with teaching and learning consistent with programme aims	Present current research as part of teaching; introducing students to practical research methodology; using research data in teaching	Reports from robust peer review; internal reference; comments made by external examiner	Getting students to use practical research methodology; engaging students in research activity	Reports from robust peer review; internal reference; comments made by external examiner; statement from external sources involved in the research
7.	Scholarship in teaching and learning	Being aware of and consistently applying good practice established by others	Reports from robust peer review; internal reference	Being aware of and developing good practice; leading initiatives to develop and maintain scholarship in teaching and learning	Reports from robust peer review; internal reference; invitations to present at good practice events within the University or nationally.
8.	Sustainable innovation that demonstrably enhances student learning	Some evidence of innovation	Internal reference; external examiner's report; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)	Sustained record of innovation that has led to changes in teaching practice	Internal reference; external examiner's report; evidence of beneficial effects (e.g. improved recruitment of students; improved student satisfaction; improved employability; more efficient use of resource, including staff time)
9.	Personal development in teaching and learning methodology and technology	Evidence of a willingness occasionally to participate in development and training opportunities	Good practice sessions attended; University-internal training and development opportunities attended	Evidence of a willingness regularly to participate in and engage with development and training opportunities	Good practice sessions attended; University internal training and development opportunities attended; external training and development events attended

B.	Broader contribution to teaching and learning within University				
	Management of teaching programmes	Involvement in the management of teaching programmes.	Internal reference	Leadership in the management of teaching programmes	Internal reference; external programme examiner's comments; other evidence of impact on the programme or on colleagues
	Development of teaching and learning policies at discipline, school, faculty or university levels	Involvement in the development of teaching and learning policies at discipline or school level	Internal reference informed by views of T&L Director in School; other evidence of impact of policies	Leadership in the development of teaching and learning policies at discipline or school level and/or involvement or leadership at faculty or university levels.	Internal reference informed by views of T&L Director in School, AD T&L or other staff outside the School; other evidence of impact of policies
	Influencing the teaching of others by providing support, mentoring or coaching of other staff or through involvement in development opportunities for other staff	Role of mentor or coach of other staff; involvement in the provision of staff development in teaching and learning	Internal reference informed by views of staff who have been supported; evidence of invitations to share good practice with others within the University; evaluations by participants in development opportunities	Leadership in staff development in teaching and learning within the University, involvement in or leadership in development opportunities outside the University	Internal reference informed by views of relevant staff outside the School where appropriate; evidence of invitations to share good practice outside the University; evaluations by participants in development opportunities
	Support for peer mentoring, PASS schemes etc	Support for ongoing activity	Internal reference; student evaluation	Role in developing new activity	Internal reference; student evaluation
	University-internal teaching grants	Occasional award	Details of grant and evidence of outcome	Sustained record of award of grants	Details of grants and evidence of outcomes
	Awards or prizes for teaching and learning	University-internal award	Details of awards	University-external award	Details of award

C.	Contribution to teaching and learning external to University				
	Publication of teaching materials or text books	Teaching material or contribution to text book	Standard data and evidence of impact of use within the University	Text book	Standard data and evidence of impact of use within the University; evidence of use outside the University
	Active involvement in professional bodies to develop discipline-specific national curricula	Occasional involvement in educational activity within bodies such as Bar Council, Royal Society or other discipline-specific organisations or contributions to subject centres, HEA	Evidence of such contribution through internal reference with input from representatives of the external body; external referee	Sustained involvement in educational activity within bodies such as Bar Council, Royal Society or other discipline-specific organisations or contributions to subject centres, HEA	Evidence of such contribution and its impact through internal reference with input from representatives of the external body; external referee
	Involvement in the delivery of executive education, CPD or training and development to other professional bodies	Occasional involvement in the delivery of training and development; some experience of developing such provision	Internal reference informed by those involved in managing the activity; external reference	Sustained involvement and leadership in design and delivery of training and development	Internal reference informed by those involved in managing the activity; external reference; other evidence of impact of activity
	Invitations to deliver teaching to other institutions	Occasional invitation	Internal reference informed by information from those involved in leading the activity; external reference; evidence of quality and impact when available	Regular invitations or visiting appointments for the purposes of teaching and learning	Internal reference informed by information from those involved in leading the activity; external reference; evidence of quality and impact when available
	Invitations to be external programme examiner	Occasional invitation	Internal reference informed by information from staff at other University; external reference	Regular invitations	Internal reference informed by information from staff at other University; external reference

	Influence on national debates on teaching and learning	Occasional contribution to national debates	Presentations at conferences; contributions to debates in the press; engagement with learned organisations promoting teaching; dissemination of good practice in well regarded publications; pedagogical research publications; active involvement in subject centre	Sustained contribution to national debates	Clear evidence of significant involvement in debates; significant contribution to events; involvement in organising, chairing or hosting national or international events
	Award of external grants for teaching and learning	Occasional award, smaller award	Details of grant and evidence of outcome	Sustained record of award of grants, larger grant	Details of grants and evidence of outcomes

Kersti Börjars (Chair of PoE WG)
December 2012