



The leading global network
of research universities
for the 21st century

U21 Recognition of Teaching Excellence Discussion Paper

Graeme Aitken and Jennifer Tatebe
Faculty of Education
University of Auckland
August 2014

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the academic and professional staff who contributed to the development of this paper through the provision of institution information related to teaching, learning, promotion and human resource policies. They include: Professor Bairbre Redmond and Elizabeth Noonan (University College Dublin), Verónica A. Patiño González and Joaquín Guerra (Tecnológico de Monterrey), Christine Barr, Director of Human Resources (University of Glasgow), Professor Pip Pattison (formerly of the University of Melbourne, currently at the University of Sydney), Jiye Choi (Korea University), Professor Anna M. Kindler and Dr. Karen Ragoonaden (University of British Columbia), and Dr. Åsa Lindberg-Sand (Lund University).

We would also like to acknowledge the members of the U21 Secretariat team who offered their guidance and expertise to this project: Lavinia Winegar Gott, Deputy Secretary General & Educational Innovation Manager and Clare Noakes, Administration Manager.

Finally, we would like to thank the U21 Educational Innovation Steering Group for contributing feedback on the draft paper.

Graeme Aitken and Jennifer Tatebe
Faculty of Education
University of Auckland
August 2014

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Introduction.....	v
Teaching and learning in university settings: The context.....	1
Academic pathway models in the U21 network.....	4
Teaching-Research Nexus (TRN)	6
The Role and Status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)	7
Teaching standards.....	12
Promotion	14
Discussion	14
Conclusion.....	16

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Academic Pathway Models</i>	4
---	---

Introduction

This paper seeks to understand the messages that research-intensive universities communicate about the importance and value of teaching, and how they define, recognise and reward teaching quality. While it is acknowledged that the internal and external influences on policy development as they relate to teaching differ by jurisdiction (for example, the differing approaches to counting teaching-only staff in research assessment exercises) and international context, this paper examines the recognition of teaching in current policy frameworks to set out possibilities for the ways in which teaching can be given prominence in research-intensive universities.

We begin with a brief historical overview of the teaching-research nexus to identify the origins of current debates about the recognition of teaching in university settings. We then explore the ways that U21 universities acknowledge the value of teaching by examining how teaching is positioned in academic appointments, the recognition of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL), and statements on standards for teaching, and promotion policies. Analysis of a range of *Universitas 21* (U21) members' policies leads us to outline a series of discussion points for further consideration about the recognition of teaching within research-intensive universities in the U21 network.

Notes about context and scope

It is important to note the scope and aims of this paper. It is designed to inform discussion and the potential development of further policy and practice associated with the recognition of teaching, and related teaching and learning initiatives within U21 member institutions. By identifying current policies, procedures and approaches to acknowledging teaching within the academy, along with recommendations for future strategies, it is hoped that this background paper will initiate discussions within the U21 community about the value and recognition of teaching.

Notes about definitions

Due to the international scope of this paper, the terms used to describe various university structures, processes and policies related to teaching and learning vary by country, and at times, by institution. As authors, we have chosen to follow the terms and wording as written in the selected institutional documents, and as described by the staff with whom we spoke to during our collection of institution-specific information related to teaching and learning. This choice reflects our understanding of the unique contextual differences in language/terms that may not directly “translate” or be generalizable across contexts, and it showcases the diversity of language related to teaching and learning used throughout our network. The attached glossary may assist readers to understand some of the international terminology used in this report.

We also acknowledge that the selection of U21 institution information related to teaching and learning in this report is limited by two factors: language and availability. Institution information discussed here comes from a variety of primary

sources, including publicly available online documents and those shared by academic and professional staff. The availability of such documents in English or translated into English was a significant factor in their inclusion in this analysis and discussion.

The Teaching-Research Nexus in university settings: The context

NORTH AMERICA

The debate concerning the teaching-research nexus is a long-standing issue in American higher education (Baldwin, 1990). Widely considered a seminal text, Boyer's (1990) *Scholarship Reconsidered*, recommends the recognition and reward of four types of scholarship: teaching, integration, application of knowledge, and discovery. He also argues for the greater integration of these identified forms of scholarship in university mission statements and other policy documents. Boyer suggests that greater alignment between scholarship inclusive of teaching, and reward would likely lead to shifts in tenure and promotion that currently privilege research. In the 1990s, growing tensions between research and teaching in the tertiary sector led to discussions about "professor vitality" (Baldwin, 1990, p. 160). Baldwin's comparative analysis of American "professor vitality" in liberal arts colleges problematises the concept but also offers professional insight into distinctions amongst faculty. His research illustrates similarities between "vital" or "star performers" (p. 163), and their academic colleagues including identical self-identified prioritisation of teaching, followed by research and scholarship, professional service and administrative duties. Similar high prioritisation of teaching amongst "star performers" and their academic colleagues in Baldwin's research contrasts with that of Boyer, which reflects differing views in the teaching-research nexus debate.

AUSTRALIA

A recent Australian report commissioned by the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR) at the University of Melbourne's Centre for the Study of Higher Education or CSHE (Bexley, James, & Arkoudis, 2011) makes a further contributions to the discussion about traditional teaching and research roles. The authors discuss the "reconceptualisation" of academia suggesting that the profession is "in transition". Their work draws on survey data from 5,525 academic staff across 20 Australian universities who took part in their study.

Three key recommendations about the teaching-research nexus emerge from Bexley et al.'s (2011) report including: (1) the need for greater integration of teaching and research (bridging what is viewed as a current research-teaching divide), (2) recognition of teaching in career pathways and for the purpose of promotions, and (3) more sophisticated academic pathways moving forward from traditional academic positions in teaching-only, teaching and research, and research-only streams. Despite acknowledging the diversity of Australian institutions and the resultant differentiation between academic roles, the authors affirm the importance of teaching as a core academic duty of across all types of academic positions.

Study participants demonstrated a strong commitment to scholarship in both teaching and research. However, they expressed a strong preference for research over teaching - 39% expressed interest in both teaching and research but "leaned" towards research; 26% chose research; 23% chose teaching and research but

“leaned” towards teaching. Only 7% signaled their preference for teaching and 5% ranked ‘leadership and administration’ as their first choice.

The report clearly identifies a strong concern regarding a perceived lack of recognition of teaching in promotion processes amongst participating academics. The majority (88%) of academics believed that teaching should be rewarded in promotion criteria, yet only 31% believe teaching is actually considered in promotion applications. Citing an earlier CSHE study in 1999, Bexley et al. (2011) illustrate how the perception of teaching’s lack of recognition is increasing over time (difference of 14% in 2010 since 1999).

In a similar manner, participants placed higher value or importance on research awards (75%) over recognition of teaching excellence awards (59%) as opposed to teaching awards. Further analysis suggests that the value placed on teaching awards is connected to one’s academic pathway. For example, research-only academic staff (43%) and postdoctoral staff (45%) place the least value on teaching awards while study participants in teaching-only positions value teaching excellence awards the most (71%). Findings signal entrenched academic perceptions of the value of teaching in academic settings.

Two final recommendations emerging from the report are relevant to this paper. First, Bexley et al. (2011) recommend for continued importance to be placed on the research-teaching nexus in all academic positions. Secondly, the authors call for more efforts to incorporate clearly defined teaching criteria into promotion policies.

SWEDEN

Bienenstock, Serger, Benner and Lidgard (2014) offer a comparative analysis between Stanford, University of California-Berkley and numerous Swedish institutions (including Lund in the U21 network) that identifies central tensions and challenges for Swedish higher education relevant to the recognition of teaching within research-intensive universities. These tensions include: (1) growing divisions between research and teaching, and (2) funding structures that arguably contribute to continued divergence of research and teaching practices and policies. The report identifies how the origins of the research-teaching divide can, in part, be attributed to the establishment of the ‘university lecturer’ position as part of educational policy in the 1950s (Bienenstock et al., 2014p. 50). The rationale was for newly established lecturers to take on more undergraduate teaching to enable professors to take primary teaching responsibility for postgraduate students. Acknowledgement of the growing emphasis on the separation of teaching and research, especially at the undergraduate level, led to a government commission in the 1990s into the recognition of teaching — recognition that continues to be a persistent challenge for the higher education sector.

The report also raised concerns about the influence of funding structures in perpetuating the growing separation between teaching and research. In Sweden, budgets for teaching and research are separate. In the past decade, public funding has increased for research while teaching budgets have remained static. Funding for teaching has been subject to diminishing resource and cost reductions throughout

the 1990s. The practice of 'teaching buy-out' for academics holding research grants is another contributing factor to the research-teaching divide. Research grant 'buy-out' functions as a criterion that separates successful grant recipients as 'researchers' and unsuccessful grant applicants as 'teachers.'

Bienenstock et al. (2014) recommend a greater focus on linking research and teaching; placing more importance on teaching; for quality teaching to be central to recruitment, selection and promotion processes; and for revision of existing funding structures to offer adequate funding for teaching.

Scholarship of Teaching in Higher Education

Chalmers (2011) moves beyond problematising the 'imbalance' between teaching and research to focus on initiatives to increase the status of teaching. She identifies three such approaches - recognition and rewards schemes; grants and professional development; and increasing the prominence of teaching in formal academic performance reviews. She notes that teaching awards schemes are often critiqued for their "rigor and defensibility" (p.28), obscurity related to the act being recognised (namely practice or scholarship), and the fact that teaching awards tend to recognise individuals rather than teaching teams.

Grants related to the improvement of student learning and the development and expansion of Centres for Teaching Excellence reflect increased recognition of the importance of teaching and learning (and of associated scholarship). Chalmer (2011) also discusses how "universities have demonstrated greater commitment to improve tenure and promotion systems to include additional recognition of different forms of scholarship such as the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning" (p. 30). Other initiatives include the development of a Professional Standards Framework in the United Kingdom, a Professional Development teaching requirement for tenure in Australia, and revisions of the scope of "scholarship" and the inclusion of teaching as part of required promotion criteria.

Several key issues emerge from this brief overview. First, discussions of teaching and learning at universities are complex and context specific. While a comparative analysis would suggest numerous similarities and differences in how teaching is perceived, recognized, and valued, socio-political differences shape the ways in which teaching is recognised through university policy and by academic staff. The international literature also suggests shared challenges and tensions surrounding the value of teaching. For instance, teaching is often represented - intentionally or otherwise - as being of a lower status than research and there is a growing divide between teaching and research. Despite these aforementioned challenges, there is a growing interest in university teaching and learning as evidenced by the rise of SoTL research, and a variety of teaching recognition initiatives.

Academic pathway models in the U21 network

The opening section of the paper offered an international context to the discussion of the recognition of teaching and learning within research-intensive universities. The table below offers a summary analysis of existing academic structures within a sample of U21 universities (Table 1). This table is not intended to be a comprehensive list of U21 academic pathways models. Instead, the examples in Table 1 serve as representative of existing academic models within the U21 network.

Table 1. Academic Pathway Models

Institution	Academic pathways				Promotion criteria
Glasgow	Research & Teaching	Research	Teaching	Veterinary Clinical Medicine	Research & scholarship Knowledge exchange and impact Teaching and learning Leadership and management Esteem
	Professor	Professor	Professor	Professor	
	Senior Lecturer	Senior Research Fellow	Senior University Teacher	Senior Vet Clinician	
	Lecturer	Research Fellow	University Teacher	Lecturer	
		Research Associate	Teaching Assistant		
UBC	Professor		Professor of Teaching	General Faculty	Assistant, Associate and Professors: Research, Teaching, & Service Professor of Teaching Promotion: Teaching, Educational Leadership, Curriculum Development & Service Instructors: Teaching & Service
	Professor		Professor of Teaching	Lecturer	
	Associate Professor		Senior Instructor		
	Assistant Professor		Instructor I and II		
Melbourne	Academic staff (Teaching and Research)		Research only staff	Research only honorary staff	Contribution to teaching and learning Research and research training Engagement Leadership & Service <i>Note:</i> measured on quality (achievements) and productivity (outputs), recognition (peer esteem) and capacity building (contribution to the university, community and/or profession)
	Professor		Professorial Fellow	Honorary Senior Lecturer	
	Associate Professor		Principal Research Fellow	Honorary Lecturer	
	Senior Lecturer		Senior Research Fellow		
	Lecturer		Senior Research Office		
	Senior tutor		Research Fellows (1&2)		
Tutor		Senior Research Assistant			
University College Dublin	Academic Staff	Research Funding	Senior Management	Research, Scholarship & Innovation	
	Professor	Professor	Professor		
	Associate Professor	Associate Professor			

	Senior Lecturer Lecturer	Senior Lecturer Lecturer	Associate Professor	Teaching & Learning Academic Leadership & Contribution		
University of Johannesburg	Teaching Assistant (TA)	Lecturer	Senior Lecturer	Associate Professor	Professor	<p>Promotion criteria for TA Up to date knowledge; teaching and learning of a high standard</p> <p>Promotion criteria for Lecturers, Associate Professors and Professors Teaching and learning and research excellence; academic involvement at local, national and international levels; community engagement varying by academic rank</p>
University of Auckland	Research Focused Research Fellow	Teaching Focused Professional Teaching Fellow (PTF) Tutor	Teaching & Research Professor Associate Professor Senior Lecturer Lecturer	<p>Promotion criteria for Research active staff Contributions to teaching; research/scholarship/artistic or professional activity; institutional planning, governance and operations; the discipline and/or the community.</p> <p>Promotion criteria for PTF Experience and achievement in Teaching and Learning. Contributions to the University in Service.</p>		
University of New South Wales	Research Professor Associate Professor Senior Lecturer Lecturer Associate Lecturer	Teaching Professor Associate Professor Senior Lecturer Lecturer Associate Lecturer Lecturer	Combined Research and Teaching Professor Associate Professor Senior Lecturer Lecturer Associate Lecturer	Promotion criteria across all tracks Strong research performance High level teaching and learning Engagement and leadership		
University of Virginia	Tenure Track University Professor Professor Associate Professor Assistant Professor Instructor	Non-Tenure track Academic Administrative and professional faculty	Limited Term positions Research Professor Professor of Practice Lecturer	Promotion criteria for tenured staff Sustained demonstration of distinguished performance in student instruction, research, and service varying by academic rank		
University of Birmingham	Academic: research focused Senior Research Fellow/Reader Research Fellow II Research Fellow I Research Associate	Academic: Teaching focused Professor Senior Lecturer Lecturer	Academic: Teaching and Research Professor Associate Professor Senior lecturer/Reader Lecturer	<p>Academic Focused: Excellence in Research, Teaching and learning, Management and administration</p> <p>Teaching Focused: Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and Management and Administration. In addition, the application must meet the supplementary criteria on: (i) significant contribution to teaching; (ii) teaching and learning contribution that replaces the research criteria;</p>		

				(iii) a higher volume of teaching and related outputs
--	--	--	--	---

Several conclusions can be drawn from this table. First, a range of models exist within the U21 network reflecting contextual differences and country specific sociopolitical influences such as national and institutional funding and research structures. Secondly, academic positions are classified into one of three ‘streams’: research, teaching or a combination of teaching and research, and research although the nomenclature within each of these streams differs. Compare for example, the use of the terms Professor and Associate Professor in each of the streams at UNSW, with the use of the terms Professor and Professor of Teaching at UBC, with the use of the terms Professor, Associate Professor in the research and teaching stream at Auckland and the Professional Teaching Fellow in the Teaching stream. UCD also uses the terms Professor and Associate Professor in a Management stream. Third, the promotion criteria typically consider the traditional mix of research, teaching and service performance although the application of this mix varies according to stream. This sample of academic structures within the U21 network serves as a basis to consider the elements that inform the structures - in particular, the teaching-research nexus, the role and status of SoTL, teaching standards, and promotion policies.

Teaching-Research Nexus (TRN)

References to the teaching-research nexus are most prominent in broad university mission statements and/or strategic plans. For example, the University of Melbourne describes their efforts to “develop curriculum for teaching and learning that is informed by our other key activities of research and knowledge transfer” (University of Melbourne, 8 April 2014) achieved through “combining” research and teaching (University of Melbourne, 12 February 2014). The University of Auckland’s Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2016 discusses “applying research-informed approaches to teaching and supervision, enhancing students’ learning outcomes, strengthening engagement, increasing retention and encouraging high levels of achievement” (p. 9). Further evidence of Auckland’s connection between teaching, learning and research is found in the Office of the Vice Chancellor’s ‘Commentary on Issues of Higher Education and Research’ which discussed “the importance of high-quality research-informed teaching to the educational experience of students” (Commentary, The University of Auckland, 2010, p. 1). The University of Glasgow describes a vision of “research-informed education” which is linked to excellence in teaching (University of Glasgow, p. 17). Teaching and learning at the University of Birmingham is “inform[ed]” by and “infused with[in a] research culture of enquiry and investigation” (University of Birmingham, 2010b, p. 12). A second Birmingham document entitled “The Birmingham Academic” provides an in-depth example of the emphasis on research-informed teaching. This document informs academic staff of the expectation of:

Undertaking teaching that is research-led, research-informed and also, where appropriate, research-centred (ie, in which students undertake research), thereby ensuring both that the curriculum is informed by current research

practice and knowledge and that it adopts approaches to learning that support the research ethos. (University of Birmingham, 2010a, p. 5)

In North America, the University of British Columbia defines an excellent learning environment as “transformative student learning through outstanding teaching and research” (University of British Columbia, 2012, p. 9). The University of Virginia’s draft 2013 Cornerstone Plan proposes the “advancement of knowledge” through “research and scholarship” (University of Virginia, 2013, p. 20). The Ohio State University’s academic plan is much more explicit in outlining its strategy of gaining international recognition through targeted investment in world class faculty and enhancing the quality of teaching and learning environment through “interdisciplinary research, teaching, and learning” as part of \$100 million USD in central funding from the Targeted Investment in Excellence (TIE) initiative (The Ohio State University, 2006).

While the teaching-research nexus is clearly part of the visionary and high-level commitment of U21 universities, it is less clear how this vision plays out in practice. This is consistent with other more detailed analyses. The Teaching-Research Nexus project or TRN (<http://trnexus.edu.au/>) is a collaborative project between the University of Melbourne’s Centre for the Study of Higher Education, Griffith University’s Institute for Higher Education and Queensland University of Technology that “examines the complexity of the teaching-research nexus in contemporary higher education” (Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Griffith University, Queensland University of Technology, & The University of Melbourne, 2008). Their analysis of 27 Australian university webpages and publicly available online documents also indicates few explicit policy discussions about the nature of the relationship between teaching and research. The TRN project recommendations include enhancing the relationship between teaching and research in five policy areas: “institutional mission; curriculum and pedagogy; research policies and strategies; staff capacity building; and institutional structures and quality assurance processes” (Australian Learning and Teaching Council et al., 2008).

The TRN study identified 17 common ways in which universities connect teaching and research and broadly group these into three categories:

- Research informed teaching
- Research based learning (i.e. research findings integrated into teaching and learning, research projects integrated into curriculum, enquiry based learning, research, research methodology coursework)
- Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

We focus in the next section on SoTL as a method of connecting teaching and research and the way that this form of scholarship is represented in U21 universities.

The Role and Status of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning (SoTL)

Despite growing interest in SoTL since its initial articulation by Boyer (1990), the way in which SoTL is recognised within U21 universities reflects considerable variation in the interpretation of its status and worth.

In some cases SoTL assumes the status of formal publication associated with promotion. For example, UBC's Professor of Teaching stream promotion criteria references SoTL under the 'Curriculum Development and Pedagogical Innovation' heading noting "contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning resulting in publications". Similarly, the University of Melbourne's Academic Promotion guidelines acknowledges SoTL through "presenting at national/international conferences on teaching and learning, national/international/university teaching and learning awards, invited contributions to teaching and learning material i.e. textbooks, media". Another direct example of SoTL recognition through publication is found in the academic promotion material citing the acts of "conducting and publishing research related to teaching" (University of Melbourne, 2013, p. 4-5). Likewise, Birmingham notes "developing and publishing pedagogic research" as a teaching and learning expectation of its academic staff (University of Birmingham, 2010a, p. 5).

Another representation of SoTL is as a form of Professional Development (PD). The University of Johannesburg's 2011 Strategic Thrust document clearly names the "formal recogni[tion] and integrat[i]on of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning" as one of its key academic priorities (University of Johannesburg, 2011b, p. 3). The University of Melbourne promotes the completion of its teaching and learning programme as part of wider "capacity building" that "expand[s] the capacity of the university and profession" (University of Melbourne, 2013p. 5). The University of Birmingham's teaching and learning expectations include "demonstrating critical self-reflection on their own teaching practice, undertaking and, as appropriate, leading professional development and training in teaching methodology/practice" as part of on-going PD (University of Birmingham, 2010, p. 5).

Most U21 member institutions offer various academic development programmes (i.e. workshops, seminars, certificates) to enhance university teaching and learning. UBC's Faculty of Education certificate on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education or the "SoTL Leadership program" is one example that is also recognised under the 'Educational Leadership' promotion criteria. Postgraduate Certificates in Higher Education are another strategic academic development offered at a number of U21 institutions, including the Universities of Glasgow, Auckland and Nottingham. While the name of the certificate differs slightly at each institution, the programmes are comparable with each institution offering academic staff opportunities to develop their theoretical and practical knowledge of teaching resulting in a formal qualification. One-day workshops on a variety of teaching and learning topics are offered across many institutions (Glasgow, Auckland, Nottingham). Nottingham's Research Training & Academic Development Office on their Malaysia campus offers research and teaching practice workshops in the areas of curriculum design, foundations of Teaching in Higher Education, Lecturing for Learning and small group teaching. Three-day workshops are also evident. The University of Auckland offers a three-day CLear Lights Leadership in Teaching programme for university staff to develop their teaching and learning skills, and another three-day programme for new academics aimed at providing an overview of university teaching key concepts and

strategies. Nottingham as well offers a three-day 'Intensive Learning and Teaching Programme' aimed at research staff and postgraduate students to improve their teaching skills and their knowledge of how to support students.

Most professional development programmes treat SoTL as a form of inquiry into, reflection on, and improvement of, teaching for the individuals concerned. There are, however, examples of a more explicit focus on SoTL as a means of researching and disseminating teaching innovations and enhancements. Many U21 institutions host SoTL focused forums, symposia and conferences. Examples include the University of Glasgow's Teaching and Learning Centre, which coordinates an 'Annual Learning and Teaching Conference'; The University of Johannesburg hosted a 'Colloquium on Teaching and Learning in Higher Education' this September, in 2012 McGill hosted the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education conference, and UNSW offers bi-annual Teaching and Learning forums that bring the university community together to discuss current teaching projects and practices.

A more sustained engagement with SoTL is evident in the funding of SoTL fellowships to research and report on institutional teaching and learning priorities. Examples include Glasgow's University Teacher's Learning Community programme, Auckland's Centre for Learning and Research in Higher Education's (CLeAR) Fellowship programme, Nottingham's Associate Teachers Programme, University College Dublin's (UCD) Fellowships in Teaching & Academic Development, the U21 network's own cross-partner Teaching and Learning Network (TLN) and a Fellowship programme to promote collaborative projects aimed at enhancing knowledge of strong teaching and learning practice across U21 institutions.

In 2006, the University of Glasgow piloted a 'University Teacher's Learning Community' as part of the University's Carnegie leadership program. Academics across 12 faculties participated in a series of workshops aimed at fostering a teaching environment in which the SoTL could be promoted across 'a wide range of activities' at the university, and to "influence University policy regarding the role and support of University Teachers" (University of Glasgow, n.d.) b. Inquiry-based learning and the evaluation of student learning were the main areas of focus. A publication in the Practice and Evidence of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education journal (set up by the University of Glasgow) was one outcome of the initiative. The University of Glasgow BeSoTLed has also developed a website (<http://www.gla.ac.uk/departments/sotl/>) devoted to discussing and promoting SoTL amongst university staff.

UCD's two-year Fellowships in Teaching & Academic Development are strategically designed to advance University-wide strategic policy in teaching and learning. Successful programme applicants complete a practice-based research group project on an institutional teaching and learning theme. For the 2014-2016 Fellowship cycle, the theme is "Exploring and developing research-teaching linkages in the delivery of high quality student learning" (University College Dublin, 2014, p. 2). One key intended outcome of the Fellowship programme is the "production of a series of evidence-based findings and recommendations which can inform the development of future institutional policy and strategy planning as well as the development of relevant academic resources for on-going enhancement" (University College Dublin, 2014, p. 1). Fellows are encouraged to disseminate the findings in publications,

conferences, and within their own Schools and Departments. Some of the questions the fellows are currently exploring are of particular relevance to this paper. Under the over-arching aim to “examine the question of research-teaching linkages in the context of a high quality student learning experience at UCD” (University College Dublin, 2014, p. 2) the Fellowship programme poses the following questions:

- How do UCD academics perceive the relationship between research and teaching? How is this reflected in their academic practice? What does UCD’s goal of research-led teaching mean from their perspective?
- What examples of good practice in both *research-led* and *researched* teaching at UCD can be identified? What examples of effective *research-led* learning for UCD undergraduates can be identified? How has *researched* teaching improved educational standards and students learning in UCD?
- What development needs/requirements do academic staff have in relation to developing a *researched* approach to their teaching and/or implementing a *research-led* teaching approach to the curriculum?
- What development needs or opportunities do students require to become *research-led* learners and graduates with advanced research capabilities?

(University College Dublin, 2014, p.2)

The University of Auckland currently offers academic staff the opportunity to apply to the Centre for Learning and Research in Higher Education’s (CLear) Fellowship programme designed for “outstanding” teachers with “potential to become a leader in the scholarship of teaching and learning for the university” (<https://www.clear.auckland.ac.nz/en.html>). The CLear Fellowship programme has four aims:

- Proactively acknowledge teaching and learning leadership and development within the university.
- Improve teaching, learning and assessment practices aligned to University strategic priorities.
- Facilitate inclusive teaching.
- Support the growth and dissemination of internationally significant teaching and learning developments.

Proposed outcomes of CLear’s Fellowship programme include publication in Higher Education journals, university-wide presentations, and inclusion in a collection of teaching cases in print and digital format.

The University of Nottingham’s Associate Teachers’ Programme is a fourth example of a more in-depth and long-term SoTL initiative. The 12-month intensive programme targets teaching, research and clinical nursing health practitioners. The programme results in the publication of a Teaching Development Report that outlines how the candidates propose to transfer their new teaching knowledge into their practice.

Another feature of SoTL in U21 universities is its recognition as a form of curriculum development. The University of Melbourne academic promotion guidelines offer an example of alignment between SoTL and curriculum development. The document discusses “scholarly activities that have influenced and enhanced learning and teaching” that include “management and leadership of courses and student learning”. University of Birmingham academic staff are expected to “draw upon advances in pedagogy, e-learning and emerging teaching technologies to enhance the students’ learning experience” (University of Birmingham, 2010a, p.5). The University of Johannesburg has established a specialized Unit for Professional Academic Staff Development (PASD) to facilitate discipline-specific curriculum development workshops. McGill’s one-year Teaching Scholars programme, a collaboration between the University’s Centre for Medical Education and the Faculty Development Office, is an example of a curriculum focused SoTL programme. Participating science and clinical academic staff meet weekly, complete two university courses in the Faculties of Education and Management with an emphasis on curriculum design and innovation. Weekly meetings align with an “independent study and personal project related to curriculum design, the improvement of teaching methods and evaluation strategies, and research in medical/health sciences education” (McGill University, 2014b) Participants are also encouraged to present their work at international and national teaching and learning conferences.

Lund University arguably offers one of the strongest examples of institutional recognition of teaching and/or the SoTL. Lund’s ‘pedagogical academy’ is unique in that it re-conceptualises how teaching is acknowledged and funded, and, as a consequence, has altered the institutional culture of teaching. The first pedagogical academy was established in the 1990s in the Faculty of Engineering with the aim of “rais[ing] the overall quality of teaching and student learning at the institutional level by rewarding excellent teachers and their departments” (Olsson & Roxå, 2013, p. 3). Acceptance into the Teaching Academy is based on a peer- reviewed teaching portfolio that presents information related to the applicant’s “teaching philosophy (reflections about teaching and student learning), together with integrated examples from their teaching practice” (p. 4). Successful candidates demonstrate strong knowledge and reflection on “student learning, development over time, and a scholarly approach to teaching and student learning” (p. 7). The system rewards successful candidates with a salary increase and the candidate’s department with additional funding for each teacher admitted into the academy. The pedagogical academy is funded from the undergraduate teaching budget with administrative costs covered by reducing funding for departments without successful pedagogical academy teachers. While reductions in funding may be relatively small, Olsson & Roxå (2013) argue that the pedagogical academy system reinforces, through institutional support, the value and importance of teaching and learning.

Olsson & Roxå (2013) observe that the pedagogical academy system also generates, through applicant portfolios, greater analysis of the content and methods of teaching, and of the links between theory and practice, and greater engagement in SoTL through conference presentations at teaching and learning conferences. Three other faculties have adopted the pedagogical academy system (Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Social Sciences, and Faculty of Natural Sciences). In 2011 the Faculty of Social Sciences adopted a pedagogical academy-inspired ‘Teaching Academy’ model that recognises teaching excellence at two levels: Qualified Teaching

Practitioner (QTP), and Excellent Teaching Practitioner (ETP). These two levels of distinction are differentiated by selection criteria which includes: a teaching portfolio, CV, recommendation from the Head of Department, discussions with two colleagues, interview, assessment panel, and decision. At the initial QTP level teachers must demonstrate knowledge of a “students’ learning process, a scholarly approach that reflects subject breadth and depth, teaching skills and commitment, holistic view and interaction, and finally continual improvement and in depth reflection” (p. 17). To be recognised as an ETP teachers, they must also have “skills in leading, organizing and reflecting on educational development, and an ability to enable creative dialogues within and between different subjects and the surrounding community” (p. 17). Lund’s recognition system has been adopted by five other Swedish universities and has generated international attention.

Teaching standards

Teaching standards across the U21 network are most commonly defined in academic performance criteria, and teaching and learning policies and relate to evidence of teaching quality, research informed knowledge, and student learning. The University of Auckland’s Academic Standards¹ for research active staff (Research Fellow, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors and Professors) define ‘contributions to teaching’ at each level. For example, at the Lecturer level it is expected that staff will “have demonstrated leadership in independent development of courses, course materials and curriculum; (and)... demonstrated teaching and supervision that is intellectually challenging, well-informed by relevant research, and (that) takes account of evidence from students to increase student understanding. At the Professor level the expectation adds a number of elements: namely, successful leadership of “academic programme initiatives that have demonstrably enhanced the quality and delivery of courses and/or programmes at the University”, teaching and supervision that is “intellectually challenging, shows confident control of relevant research-informed content, and systematically uses evidence from students to modify teaching to increase student understanding and engagement”, mentoring of early career teachers, and being “recognised as a leader in teaching and learning through publications, presentations to professional conferences or workshops, or mentoring of other staff”. While specified in bullet point form, the standards are interpreted and applied holistically.

Academic standards for four levels of Professional Teaching Fellows or PTFs (part of the teaching-focused stream at Auckland) use similar criteria and make explicit the teaching-research nexus. PTF teaching must be “informed by an in-depth and confident understanding of current research in the discipline and, where relevant, by expert and comprehensive knowledge of professional practice” and “(demonstrate) teaching that is informed by understanding of research on teaching and learning in higher education”. While not naming it as such, SoTL also features prominently in the standards. So at PTF4, for example, the expectation is that staff will “(demonstrate) the ability to draw on the research base on teaching and learning in higher education to evaluate alternative approaches to teaching and to explain

¹ <https://www.staff.auckland.ac.nz/en/human-resources/career-development/performance-and-development-reviews/academic-promotions.html>

selection of approach/es for particular groups of students; (demonstrate) sustained commitment to improving learning and engagement for all students; (lead) the development and evaluation of innovations in teaching and learning and have them peer-reviewed for their impact on student understanding and engagement; and (lead) the dissemination of effective practice”.

The University of Birmingham’s description of teaching also emphasises the teaching-research nexus. The Birmingham academic is an individual whose teaching is “research-led, research-informed and also, where appropriate, research-centred (i.e. in which students undertake research), thereby ensuring both that the curriculum is informed by current research practice and knowledge and that it adopts approaches to learning that support the research ethos” (University of Birmingham, 2010a, p. 5). Teaching innovation and support for student learning are two of the academic standards at the University of Glasgow. Academics at the University of Johannesburg need to demonstrate high standards of “discipline-based knowledge to enable teaching and learning of a high standard” (University of Johannesburg, 2008, p. 1). Evidence of “high quality teaching” at McGill University comes in the form of course evaluation ratings, teaching accomplishments such as teaching awards, peer review commentary, unsolicited letters from students and alumni and invitations to teach based on reputation (McGill University, 2014a, p. 20). Melbourne academic staff involved in teaching and research are asked to develop a teaching and scholarly profile that involves teaching in small and large groups and supervision, curriculum and assessment design, reflective practice, positive student course evaluations at entry level. More senior staff must also illustrate their contribution to teaching policy and practice and the “development of innovative strategies that have enhanced teaching and learning” (University of Melbourne, 2012, p. 2). All three UCD pathways (academic, research-funded, and senior management) must show evidence of contributions to teaching. Sustained and successful contributions to curriculum design, delivery, content or SoTL may be used as evidence of teaching contributions in academic and senior management streams. The research-funded pathway also requires an established teaching record.

Teaching standards are also discussed in institutional policy documents such as University teaching and learning plans. In most cases, references to such standards are broad statements. Recurring descriptors such as “excellence in teaching” and “high-quality” are often used to describe university teaching and learning objectives. The University of Auckland’s Learning and Teaching Plan 2013-2016 outlines the aim of building a “student-focused teaching and learning environment” that is flexible, uses new technology, and meets the needs of an increasingly diverse student population (University of Auckland, 2012, p. 3). Its implementation plan is a collaborative effort led by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor Academic, involving the University’s Teaching and Learning Quality Committee and staff across each faculty. The University of Johannesburg addresses its goal of “improv[ing] the quality of our teaching and learning” primarily through investment in staff academic development (University of Johannesburg, 2012, p. 16). The University of Melbourne’s equity-focused university plan makes a pledge to “place an equal emphasis on teaching” and research in addition to strong investments in academic staff development to achieve excellence in teaching and learning (University of Melbourne, 2011, p. 2). Other teaching and learning plans offer further details about the implementation of

the proposed teaching goals. UBC's strategic plan (2012) describes the use of revolutionary teaching practices in the classroom and enhanced outside of the classroom experiences through service learning, co-operative education, internships and mentorships. In a similar manner, UCD's teaching and learning report for 2007-2012 presents a three-fold approach to excellence in education by "enhancing teaching standards, creating innovative curricular structures and rewarding excellence in teaching and educational leadership" (University College Dublin, 2012, p. 3).

Promotion

Promotion policies across the U21 network follow the traditional research, teaching and service components of academic positions. Weighting of teaching criteria in the promotion process varies by academic 'stream' with teaching-focused streams tending to place more emphasis on teaching and service role components. For example, University of Melbourne's teaching and research positions must demonstrate excellence across all three components of research, teaching and service; however, teaching specialists whose main role is teaching and practice are not required to present evidence of their research activity. Similar promotion policies that place more value on teaching are found amongst other institutions with teaching focused streams (UBC, Auckland, Glasgow, UNSW and Birmingham). Evidence of teaching "excellence" most often includes positive student evaluations, high student achievement scores, publications related to teaching and learning and/or SoTL, and receipt of a teaching award.

A wide variety of teaching awards exist across the network. Awards vary by level (institution-wide/Faculty/school/department/Centre for Learning), and by monetary value. UCD teaching awards hold a value of €1000 and the University of Connecticut's ITL Teaching Scholar and Teaching Fellow awards come with a US\$2000 bonus. Adjunct academics are eligible for a US\$1000 Outstanding Teaching Award and Graduate Teaching Assistants may receive a US\$500 award for demonstrated teaching excellence. Regardless of the monetary value, each institution reviewed as part of this project offered some form of teaching award.

Discussion

This paper raises a number of matters for further discussion. First is the growing prevalence of teaching 'streams' or teaching-focused positions. We ask:

- **To what extent does this trend formalise existing divisions between research and teaching? What is the value, and what are the drawbacks, of offering individuals the ability to focus on one aspect of academic life? To what extent should those who are expert in teaching be able to have this recognised in titles (e.g. Professor) that are equivalent of recognition in research and teaching streams? Does excellence in teaching need to be reflected in establishing separate streams or is it better reflected in giving greater weight to**

outstanding teaching in Professorial applications within the research-teaching stream?

A related matter is the extent to which, where teaching streams extend to the highest level (Professor), it is possible to have the same level of international refereeing of promotions. We ask:

- **Would there be value in the U21 network establishing a pool of senior academics who are demonstrably leaders of teaching who could act as referees for teaching-focused promotion applications to Professor (and Associate Professor)?**

The second is the language used in policy documents. Promotion policies often employ generic terms such as “high quality teaching” and/or “effectiveness of teaching” (University of New South Wales, 2014, p. 2). Similarly, academic staff are required to “contribute to teaching” and demonstrate “teaching excellence” (University College Dublin, 2012) and “distinguished performance in student instruction” (University of Virginia, 10 May, 2011) that are often unaccompanied by detailed definitions or examples of quality or excellence. By contrast, teaching standards at Auckland are specific and differentiated by level. We ask:

- **Is there an advantage in more detailed language being developed in promotion policies and standards to describe desired teaching and learning characteristics?**

The third concerns the growing encouragement for academic publications about teaching and learning and/or SoTL work. This trend likely reflects the research-intensive environment of U21 institutions. We ask:

- **What value does a coherent SoTL strategy add to research-intensive universities? What SoTL expectations can reasonably be expected to be part of standards for promotion for those in research and teaching streams, and those in teaching-only streams? What “research” weight should be given to publications about teaching? Does a greater emphasis on SoTL transfer research outputs from the disciplinary field to outputs on teaching and, if so, is there a “cost” to this?**

The fourth concerns the ways in which teaching and the teaching-research nexus are represented in policy documents. While there are exceptions — for example, Nottingham’s strategic plan 2010-2015, UBC’s Place and Promise Plan 2012 and Auckland’s Strategic Plan 2013-2020 and Academic Standards – research is mentioned first in most policy documents and on many university websites. We ask:

- **Does this sequencing unintentionally contribute towards the privileging of research over teaching?** The teaching-research nexus, while often stated in aspirational terms is less evident at the level of policy.

- **How might the aspiration be strengthened through greater integration and articulation in policy documents related to research, teaching and promotion?**

And finally, there are a number of practices across U21 universities that aim to increase the status of teaching. We understand that these often operate within what Bienenstock et al. (2014) refer to as the active resistance and snobbery which perpetuates the perception of 'pedagogical knowledge' as generic and low level by some academics and administrators. We also understand that existing university organizational structures (i.e. funding) may pose significant challenges when implementing teaching related change at the institutional level. We ask:

- **What forms of recognition of teaching are the most salient and impactful in raising the status of teaching and teaching-related knowledge in research-intensive universities?**

Conclusion

In closing we acknowledge that this paper may stimulate additional questions about the recognition of teaching in research-intensive universities in the U21 network. We welcome these ideas and look forward to continuing this discussion.

References

Australian Learning and Teaching Council, Griffith University, Queensland University of Technology & The University of Melbourne. (2008). The teaching-research nexus: A guide for academics and policy-makers in higher education. Retrieved from <http://trnexus.edu.au/>

Baldwin, R. G. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the research university: Extending a contextual concept. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 61(2), 160-180. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1981960>

Bexley, E., James, R., & Arkoudis, S. (2011). *The Australian academic profession in transition: Addressing the challenge of reconceptualising academic work and regenerating the academic workforce*. ERIC.

Bienenstock, A., Schwaag Serger, S., Benner, M., & Lidgard, A. (2014). *Combining excellence in education, research and impact: Inspiration from Stanford and Berkeley and implications for Swedish universities*. Stockholm, Sweden: SNS Förlag.

Boyer, E. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chalmers, D. (2011). Progress and challenges to the recognition and reward of the scholarship of teaching in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 30(1), 25-38. doi:10.1080/07294360.2011.536970

Commentary, The University of Auckland. (2010). Teaching and learning in a research-led university.5

Corcoran, M., & Clark, S. M. (1984). Professional socialization and contemporary career attitudes of three faculty generations. *Research in Higher Education*, 20(2), 131-153.

McGill University. (2014a). *Regulations relating to the employment of tenure track and tenured academic staff*. McGill University.

McGill University. (2014b). Teaching scholars program. Retrieved from <http://www.mcgill.ca/medicinesfacdev/programs/tsp>

Ohio State University. (2006). *Academic plan 2006 update*. Columbus: Ohio State University.

Olsson, T., & Roxå, T. (2013). Assessing and rewarding excellent academic teachers for the benefit of an organization. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 3(1), 40-61.

University College Dublin. (2012). *Teaching and learning report 2007-2012*. Dublin: University College Dublin.

University College Dublin. (2014). *Call for UCD fellowships in teaching and academic development*. Dublin: University College Dublin.

University of Auckland (n.d.) a. *Academic standards for professional teaching fellows*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

University of Auckland (n.d.) b. *Academic standards for Research Fellows, Senior Research Fellows, Lecturers, Senior Lecturers, Associate Professors and Professors*. Auckland: University of Auckland Human Resources.

University of Auckland. (2012). *The University of Auckland learning and teaching plan 2013-2016*. Auckland: University of Auckland.

University of Birmingham. (2010a). *The Birmingham Academic*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

University of Birmingham. (2010b). *Shaping our future: Birmingham 2015*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

University of British Columbia. (2012). *Place and Promise: The UBC Plan*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

University of Glasgow. (n.d.) a. *Glasgow 2020: A Global Vision*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow.

University of Glasgow. (n.d.) b. The University of Glasgow university teacher's learning community. Retrieved from <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/learningteaching/researchandscholarship/carnegieleadershipprogramme/learningcommunity/>

University of Johannesburg. (2008). *Minimum appointment and promotion criteria for academic employees*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

University of Johannesburg. (2011a). *Institutional transformation plan*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

University of Johannesburg. (2011b). *University of Johannesburg strategic thrusts: 2011-2020*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

University of Johannesburg. (2012). *Teaching and learning report 2012*.

Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

University of Melbourne. (12 February 2014). Learning and teaching. Retrieved from

<http://about.unimelb.edu.au/strategy-and-leadership/learning-and-teaching>

University of Melbourne. (2011). *The University Plan 2011-2014*. Melbourne:

University of Melbourne.

University of Melbourne. (2012). *Categories of employment procedure: Indicative*

work focus category requirements (teaching and research). University of

Melbourne.

University of Melbourne. (2013). *Academic promotions: Criteria guidelines*.

Melbourne: University of Melbourne.

University of Melbourne. (8 April 2014). Strategy and leadership. Retrieved from

<http://about.unimelb.edu.au/strategy-and-leadership>

University of New South Wales. (2014). *Academic promotions: 2014 policy &*

procedures. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

University of Virginia. (10 May, 2011). Policy: Promotion and tenure. Retrieved from

<https://policy.itc.virginia.edu/policy/policydisplay?id=PROV-017>

University of Virginia. (2013). *The Cornerstone Plan: A strategic plan for the*

academic division of the University of Virginia. Charlottesville: University of

Virginia.