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Introduction

The University of Western Australia is one of eight pilot universities who have been trialling an implementation of the Teaching Quality Indicators (TQI) framework as part of Stage 2 of a national Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) project. For background to the Teaching Quality Indicators project both nationally and within UWA please see: www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/indicators

The evidence suggests that in order to improve teaching quality it is crucial that universities have systems and processes in place which demonstrate the value placed on teaching by the institution. Equally important is the ability for the university to robustly evaluate its efforts in this area. Only with valid indicators for reward and recognition processes, and a system which embeds the assessment of such indicators in to everyday activities, can the university move systematically to enhance the reward and recognition of its teaching staff. The research shows that an institutional climate which values and rewards high quality teaching is likely to have a positive impact on student learning outcomes (Chalmers, 2007).

The need for UWA to focus on the promotion, recognition and reward of teaching through the TQI project was agreed by the steering group following a comprehensive snapshot review of current teaching and learning policy and practice in November 2007, which identified a number of areas relating to the reward and recognition of staff where the university could make improvement. Other sub-projects have been implemented to address issues in professional development of teaching, and to develop criteria used to evaluate teaching quality for promotion and professional development review processes.
This paper arises from the Reward and Recognition indicators sub-project which has focused on ways that the evaluation of promotion, recognition and reward structures for UWA academic teaching staff can be embedded into university practice, in order that enhancement in these areas can be robustly measured and evaluated. The paper suggests a way forward both for the development of qualitative and quantitative performance indicators in this area, and also for the development and revision of evaluative systems within the university in to which such indicators can be incorporated.

Background to this Report

The Teaching Quality Indicators (TQI) framework has two main parts; the first is a conceptual framework (see figure 1) which identifies four dimensions of practice which have the potential to impact on student learning outcomes, at various levels of the institution, and the way that they can be meaningfully evaluated through the use of different types (input, process, output, outcomes) of performance indicators. The second is a series of framework tables which identify potential performance indicators in each of the four dimensions, across four levels of the institution (institution, faculty, program, and teacher).

![Figure 1: Teaching Quality Indicators Framework](image)

The Reward and Recognition indicators sub-project commenced with a detailed analysis of the framework table ‘rewarding and recognising teaching’ within the Institutional Climate and Systems dimension to identify indicators which were potentially relevant to the operational and strategic priorities of the university. Further mapping was also undertaken to compare the availability of data sets relating to the reward and recognition of teaching at UWA against the quantitative indicators suggested as relevant by the framework, and a baseline data report published. Simultaneously, a small research project was undertaken into performance funding models for teaching and learning at other Australian universities.

Following the development of a consolidated set of potential indicators, the TQI steering group identified a number of priority areas for the university on which a system of indicators would concentrate:

1. Professional Development of Teaching
2. Appointment Criteria and Process
3. Annual Review Process
4. Promotion Criteria and Process
5. Teaching Evaluations (student and peer)
6. Teaching Awards and Grants
7. Support for teaching staff provided by schools

Evaluating Promotion, Recognition and Reward of Teaching

This paper arises from the research and development summarised above and sets out the principles for the development of a system of promotion, recognition and reward indicators at UWA. It recognises the importance of each level of the university taking responsibility for teaching quality (Chalmers, 2007); the importance of using a balance of different types of indicators for evaluation (Chalmers, 2008); the advantages of a coherent aligned system in effecting change; and the need to engage faculties and schools with the indicators through the use of incentives and rewards.

The following indicators have been identified through the TQI framework and are organised by the priority areas identified by the project’s steering group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Area</th>
<th>Input</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Clear, well established and understood appointment processes and policies that actively support contributions to learning and teaching.</td>
<td>Appointments made with clear basis of evidence on teaching quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Clear, well established and understood annual review processes and policies that actively encourage contributions to learning and teaching</td>
<td>PDR completion rate</td>
<td>Satisfaction of staff with PDR process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Clear, well established and understood promotion and career progression processes and policies that actively support contributions to learning and teaching</td>
<td>Rate of promotion for staff with teaching focus</td>
<td>Satisfaction of staff with promotion process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Comprehensive, well established and understood professional development of teaching processes, programs and policies that actively engage all teaching staff of the university</td>
<td>Participation rate</td>
<td>Satisfaction / completion rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School support for teaching</td>
<td>Process in place to ensure that staff are provided with leadership opportunities in teaching and learning, and guidance on which staff are encouraged to apply for promotion and for study leave with a teaching focus; and in which staff are encouraged to discuss teaching research and where workloads, contracts etc. are monitored closely</td>
<td>Nos. of promotion and study leave applications with a focus on teaching; Nos. participating in professional development activities</td>
<td>Staff satisfaction with teaching support</td>
<td>Student evaluations of teaching at school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluations</td>
<td>Comprehensive, systematic and coherent student evaluation of teaching policies and processes</td>
<td>Survey satisfaction rates</td>
<td>Use of student evaluations in promotion, PDR, and school/faculty target setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Review</td>
<td>Comprehensive, systematic and coherent peer review of teaching policies and processes</td>
<td>No. of staff participating in peer review system</td>
<td>Use of peer review results in promotion and PDR processes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and Funding</td>
<td>Comprehensive and inclusive</td>
<td>No. of awards and % success rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grants teaching and learning awards, grants and scholarships programs which actively promote excellence and research in teaching and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>(applications to awards/grants)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*Indicators in *italics* are currently being developed by other TQI sub-projects

**Developing Indicators**

**Process Indicators - Benchmarks**

UWA and Macquarie University are in the process of developing a set of benchmark statements based on the ‘rewarding and recognising teaching’ table from the Institutional Climate and Systems dimension of the TQI framework. It is intended that these benchmark statements will form the basis of an exercise between the two institutions as part of the wider TQI project, however they are also intended to become part of a resource which can be used by any Australian institution to review their practice against the TQI framework, setting priorities for development and identifying their position in a development cycle. Eventually it is hoped that similar benchmarks will be developed for each of the four dimensions of the TQI framework. Draft statements are currently under discussion at the two universities.

These benchmark statements can be used systematically to set priorities for ongoing policy development and enhancement both at the university level and for individual faculties / schools; in some areas this is already occurring through the TQI project. The benchmark statements are necessarily a qualitative tool, and whilst they allow comparison between institutions or faculties, any assessment of performance using the statements will require contextualisation and should be undertaken as part of a developmental process.

**Numerical Indicators / Statistical Collections**

The university currently lacks many of the detailed statistical collections suggested by the TQI framework for evaluation of reward and recognition structures of the university.

Significant work is needed to develop the statistical collections which will enable the university to robustly evaluate progress in this area. In particular, the university may decide to develop data collections for the following indicators:

1. PDR completion rate (100% required)
2. Professional development of teaching participation / completion rates
3. No. of staff participating in Peer Review of Teaching system
4. Rate of promotion for staff with a teaching focus
5. External Awards and grants – applications as % of staff; success as % of applications
6. Internal Awards and grants – number available and funding

In addition, the university may also consider the merit of developing more detailed data collections which will allow the evaluation of the following outcome indicator:

7. Staff satisfaction with teaching support (including review, promotion, professional development, school support) [potential use of the existing instrument the ‘working life survey’ or development of a new annual staff satisfaction survey]

and may also wish to consider the merit of developing mechanisms to report on the output indicator:

8. Nos. of staff taking study leave with a teaching and learning focus

For each of these indicators, data should be available which allows analysis at the faculty and school level; by equity groups; by type of staff (e.g. permanent / casual; full-time/part-time; academic / general); and level of staff. Eventually, longitudinal analysis should also be made available. Further, these statistics should be held in a central location, reported on an annual basis, and be available to all members of the university community who have responsibility for operational and strategic planning or carriage of teaching and learning matters. Some of the above data collections may be more useful in comparison with other like universities (external
awards for example). In some areas progress toward the development of these indicators has already commenced.

The university already has significant data collections relating to student evaluations of teaching / student satisfaction, however much of this data is not available in aggregated format because of the confidential and voluntary nature of the SPOT survey and cannot therefore be used by the university in evaluating institutional performance. Whilst the SURF can be used for this purpose, it is not a direct evaluation of teaching, but is instead focused on the organisation of a unit. All instruments used to collect student satisfaction data are currently under review by the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning). The outcome of this review will determine the ways in which student evaluations of teaching can be used as indicators for institutional performance. Of particular importance is the reporting of student evaluation of teaching data in aggregated format at the school level, including the availability of comparative data.

**RECOMMENDATION 1:** The University work toward the development and implementation of reward and recognition performance indicators based on the TQI framework

**Developing Systems**

**Operational Priority Plans (OPP)**

Reward and Recognition Indicators will have the greatest impact if they are integrated in to mainstream planning and accountability processes. Indicators relating to the Reward and Recognition of Teaching are relevant for both the Education section of the Operational Priorities Plan (OPP) and the People and Resources section, and the project is working toward incorporation of the TQI project in the 2009 – 2013 plan with the relevant working parties.

Data collections to support target setting in these areas will not be available for a number of years, however their development will allow such data to be used in the future to measure progress, through reporting in publications such as the annual Teaching and Learning Indicators report and the incorporation of targets into future operational priority plans.

**School / Course Reviews**

Evaluation of indicators relating to the reward and recognition of staff can be incorporated in to the existing school and course review processes as one way of ensuring that responsibility is taken at the school level, and policy is appropriately embedded. Indicators relating to school support for teaching staff, including the use of the benchmark statements at the school level, and analysis of the numerical indicators suggested above, can be used by schools as evidence of quality in teaching portfolios and included in the terms of reference for school and course reviews.

**Incentives and Rewards**

The university already has a number of funding mechanisms to support teaching and learning including the Distinguished Teaching and Learning Award for Schools and a number of grant schemes aimed at individuals and faculties which award funds for specific projects. The university also allocates funds received from the Learning and Teaching Performance Fund (LTPF) to faculties for activities related to enhancing teaching and learning, and this allocation includes a performance component.

There are a number of options for expanded incentive and reward schemes to promote teaching and learning quality which the university may consider:

1. Incentive scheme for schools based on indicators relating to staff engagement with teaching and learning such as gaining a qualification in university teaching, receiving a teaching award, or publishing research on university teaching.
2. Performance funding of teaching and learning at the faculty level – either:
   a. Automatic allocation of budget monies according to performance on numerical
      performance indicators; or
   b. Allocation of budget monies on the basis of a report submitted by each faculty
      evaluating their performance against chosen indicators, identifying priorities
      for enhancement
   c. Allocation of budget monies on the basis of faculties meeting set targets –
      performance indicators are used to determine whether the faculty has met a
      pre-determined benchmark.

Option b. allows greater flexibility to account for disciplinary context, and the inclusion
of qualitative indicators, however it requires an evaluation panel to consider the
submissions and make decisions regarding budget allocations. Option c. removes the
competitive aspect of a performance funding scheme, whilst retaining the reward for
excellence concept, as faculties do not compete against each other for funds;
however it may be more difficult to incorporate qualitative indicators.

For any of these options, there are three main types of indicators which may contribute to a
performance funding scheme:

1. Output/outcome numerical performance indicators relating to students such as
   progress and retention, completion, CEQ, SURF and GDS. Discipline context can be
   taken in to account by using comparisons with like disciplines in the G08. These
   types of indicators are already used extensively by the university.
2. Output/outcome numerical performance indicators relating to staff such as
   participation rates in PDR, peer review and professional development; publications in
   teaching; and success in awards and grants for teaching and learning
3. Process indicators - usually measured through the submission of a self-assessment
   report. It is suggested that the proposed benchmark statements based on the TQI
   framework could contribute to such an assessment.

The development of any an incentive/reward system would need to be carefully formulated,
and include a balance of incentive funding which encourages faculties / schools to engage
with teaching and learning issues and commit to enhancement; and rewards those faculties /
schools which demonstrate excellent teaching and learning practices.

**Monitoring Inputs – Award and Grant funding**
The funding provided by the institution and faculties for awards, grants and scholarships
relating to teaching and learning (and hence, the number of awards/ grants that are offered) is
an important aspect of improving the quality of teaching at the university, and provides a tool
for evaluating the university’s commitment to teaching and learning. These indicators may be
most useful in comparison with other universities rather than as an internal indicator; however
the maintenance of current levels of funding should be monitored internally. This data is
currently being collected through the TQI on-line database of teaching and learning policy and
practice.

**RECOMMENDATION 2:** The University develop and implement systems for the best use of
performance indicators to enhance teaching and learning quality

**Conclusion**
The development of promotion, recognition and reward indicators for the university will require
the collaboration of a number of different sections of the university and a strong commitment
from the university that such evaluation is a valuable tool for the enhancement of the student
learning experience at UWA. On their own, the identification of valid indicators of the quality
of teaching and teacher support are not sufficient to improve practice – it is the way such
indicators are used in evaluative systems that determines whether improvements in university
processes and systems which support academic teaching staff are made, and sustained.
Recommendations

1. The University work toward the development and implementation of reward and recognition performance indicators based on the TQI framework
2. The University develop and implement systems for the best use of performance indicators to enhance teaching and learning quality
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