

Teaching Portfolios in Applications for Academic Promotions in Australian Universities

Elizabeth Santhanam, The University of Western Australia
(ICED conference presentation <http://www.csd.uwa.edu.au/iced2002/abstract/Santhanam.html>)

Teaching evidence in application for academic promotion

- The web sites of 38 Australian universities were investigated to find out the kind of teaching evidence required in applications for academic promotion. The results of this investigation are as follows:

Teaching evidence	No. of Institutions
Teaching portfolios required	8
Other portfolios/ profiles required	8
Teaching portfolios suggested	5
Topics of teaching evidence listed	14
Information not readily available	3

- Almost all institutions required or suggested a detailed list of teaching related information to be included in applications for academic promotion. Applicants were expected to show evidence of their achievement, performance, contribution, scholarship and/or experience in teaching.
- The criteria for academic promotion were often placed under the broad headings: research, teaching and service. Two universities adopted/adapted the categories used by Boyer (1990), i.e. scholarship of discovery, integration, application and teaching.
- Scholarship was seen as: a criterion separate to teaching and research, a criterion in association with either teaching or research, or a sub-set of the 'teaching' criterion.
- The 'teaching' criterion was sometimes associated with supervision, curriculum development, educational development and/or learning.

Assessment of teaching evidence

- Some institutions asked the applicants to indicate the weightings they would like for each criterion/category within a suggested framework (e.g. 30-80% for teaching and educational development), while others specify such weightings according to the academic position (e.g. 30% for *teaching and supervision* if promotion is from Level B to Level C Academic).
- Higher academic levels seem to require less weighting in teaching and more in research and service criteria.
- A variety of rating scales was used in the assessment of evidence for each criterion. Some of the rating scales are shown in the table below:

Highest rating	Lowest rating	Points in scale
Excellent	Extremely weak	7
Exceptional	Poor	6
Very high degree of merit	No merit	5
Outstanding	Insufficient	5
Very strong	Very weak	5
Distinguished	Satisfactory	4
Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	2

- While the rating scales were mainly for the use of assessors, in a few institutions the applicants were required to select the ranking level e.g. "indicate the attainment level for which the criterion is to be considered".

*If one of the criteria for academic promotion/tenure in your university is 'teaching':
How is it defined? How should it be defined? How is assessed? How should it be assessed?*

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