

Academic Career Pathways – Lecturer: Key Principles

Outcome

To deliver our ambition, we need a workforce with the differentiated skills necessary to ensure that we can deliver excellence in research, teaching, learning, and the wider student experience, and to be a powerhouse for the regional economy and internationally. The Academic Career Pathways (ACP) scheme is designed to ensure that academic strengths whether in research, teaching, the wider student experience, leadership or innovation and engagement, are all appropriately recognised, developed, valued, and rewarded.

The purpose of this approach is to support all academic staff to work to their full potential. The ACP criteria are designed to be transparent, fair and provide an indication of the thresholds. Given the range of academic activity, the Indicative Performance Levels cannot be definitive but act as a guide.

New members of staff are normally subject to probation. Following the completion of probation, members of staff will be supported via the University's Professional Development Review (PDR) process.


Strands and Criteria

1. There are 3 Core criteria which must be maintained throughout all academic grades of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor (grades 8-11):
 - Core Management
 - Core Research
 - Core Teaching


2. There are 3 Enhanced academic strands:
 - Enhanced Research
 - Enhanced Teaching and Scholarship
 - Enhanced Innovation and Engagement

The three career pathways, based on excellence in research (R), teaching and scholarship (T) or innovation and engagement (IE) are shown diagrammatically below. As part of the career pathways, core criteria, must be maintained at all levels, for example Management, which is common for all strands. Each career pathway is shown below.


Research



Teaching and Scholarship



Innovation and Engagement



- The same 4 Enhanced criteria apply at each grade level but are increasingly challenging at each successive level
- The criteria specified at lower grades are assumed at the higher grades in each strand (e.g. the criteria in grade 8 are assumed in grade 9).
- The ACP are designed to be developmental. Members of staff should be supported in their development. Development is taken into account for probationary staff during their probationary period.

Criterion

- Each criterion at each grade has clearly defined examples, which indicate a selection of additional evidence required.
- Academic leadership (in the sense that members of staff are leaders in their field) is incorporated into the academic strands.

Indicative Performance Levels

8. Each criterion at each grade has clearly defined examples and Indicative Performance Levels. Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University's strategic priority is indicated in bold.
9. The Indicative Performance Levels apply pro rata for part time staff and are considered as appropriate. Part time staff should demonstrate the same quality as set out in the Indicative Performance Levels but fewer examples may be appropriate for part time staff'.
10. The impact of any individual circumstances should be taken into account when considering Indicative Performance Levels, for example (but not limited to) career breaks, any periods of leave or secondment or any other absences, for example, maternity leave or breaks for caring responsibilities.
11. Clinical academic staff* are considered against the Indicative Performance Levels on a pro-rata basis on the basis of the proportion of their contract that is academic, in the same way as part time staff. (*Does not apply to honorary appointments).

Academic Promotion

12. Each criterion at each grade has a number of 'Indicative Performance Levels' and examples of how the criterion may be met. Indicative Performance Levels are indicative of what is expected from staff applying for promotion.
13. Applicants need to demonstrate:
 - The enhanced criteria in their chosen strand (Research, Teaching & Scholarship or Innovation & Engagement) at the grade to which they are making application;
and
 - The Core criteria in Management and the Core criteria in either Teaching or Research (i.e. not in the chosen strand)
14. Those applying for promotion must demonstrate how they meet the criteria set out in the relevant role profile. To do this an applicant should carefully explain in their application:
 - How they have achieved the level of competence suggested by the Indicative Performance Levels alongside each criterion.

- Demonstrate how they have achieved the appropriate performance level, giving examples from their work, supported by evidence (examples may be similar to the examples set out in the role profile, or may be different examples provided they are of similar quality).

15. Where applicants are not able to demonstrate that they meet a particular criterion in full or in part, but nevertheless consider that they have a case for promotion based on strengths in areas covered by other criteria within the career strand, they should not be discouraged from applying for promotion. In these circumstances applicants should:

- ensure that strength in other areas is fully explained and evidenced;
and
- provide an explanation of why a particular criterion cannot be met, and if appropriate include evidence in support.

16. Where applicants are seeking to establish a criterion, the Indicative Performance Level and the examples included alongside each criterion should be seen as guidance on the performance level to be demonstrated in order to make the case for promotion. Applicants should first consider whether they meet the indicators included alongside each criterion. If these are not met, applicants should consider whether they can provide evidence at a comparable level.

If applicants are unable to demonstrate that they have met a particular Indicative Performance Level, they may be able to demonstrate equivalence and should make it clear where this is the case and explain how equivalence is claimed. The Promotion Committee considers each criterion and the evidence provided but also takes a holistic view of the application as a whole.

Applicants who consider that they meet all the Indicative Performance Levels should not assume that promotion is automatic. Applicants should provide sufficient evidence and examples for the panel to consider the promotion case fully.

17. If appointed within the last 5 years and applying for promotion, we would expect evidence since appointment to demonstrate a sustained track record.

In this instance, we would encourage that the following should be clearly included in the narrative section of the application form:

- activity within your last 5 years from the previous appointment
- new activity since being appointed at Swansea

Academic Career Pathways Core Criteria – Management

Criteria	Indicative Performance Level	Examples
<p>1. <u>Contributing to our Activities</u></p> <p>Taking an active part in formulating University, Faculty, School or departmental decisions and contributing to activities beyond the immediate research, teaching or scholarship commitments.</p>	<p>Your 4 most significant contributions over the last 5 years that show your personal contribution and impact.</p> <p>The degree of impact could be on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - your students or your team - your discipline or department - your Faculty/School - the University - externally 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as a member of a departmental, School, Faculty or University Committee • as an active contributor to initiatives or measures that promote equality • as a member of a working group within the School/Department set up to make recommendations to a Faculty/School Committee, e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - making recommendations relating to changes to the assessment of a module to the relevant Committee - making decisions on potential teaching directions - making decisions on potential research lines to pursue or on innovative methodology that might be adopted - reviewing and improving internal procedures (e.g. assessment, pastoral arrangements, timetabling) • to Student Experience initiatives e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving the experience of students with regard to pastoral care - improving the experience of international students e.g. facilitating their integration into the wider student community - improving the experience of non-traditional students, disabled students, ethnic minority students - improving student placement experiences • the Faculty admissions and recruitment process by participating in interviews or giving talks • the recruitment of international students

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the effective delivery of co-ordinating roles, such as, co-ordinating fieldwork or student placements • to a conference/workshop, organisation of examinations or an external event • to establishing information or communication systems for the Faculty/School or externally • working together across the University and beyond • contributing to the Faculty or University via roles such as Admissions Tutor, Exams Co-ordinator • as an internal panel/peer assessment member for research grants and/or outputs • as a UoA lead for REF • as PhD examiner and Chair
2.	<u>Participating in Professional Activities</u> Engaging with professional activities related to the discipline through networking at conferences or involvement in external groups.	Your 2 most significant contributions over the last 5 years that show your personal contribution and impact.	<i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as an active member of external networks, e.g. to secure funding or to further understanding • through developing contacts outside research or teaching teams in order to build on academic expertise, and to discuss and share information and ideas • participating in national subject specialist groups (e.g. for research or scholarship) • as a member of and engaging with an external professional body through attendance at events • through an external or professional body • through professional networks • with external stakeholders • maintaining professional qualifications/standing • networking at conferences that lead to an outcome, e.g. a new partnership

3.	<u>Managing Self and Others</u> Supporting and enabling the development of colleagues and yourself.	Your 2 most significant contributions over the last 5 years that show your personal contribution and impact.	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <p><i>(N.B.1 Please do not use personal names in examples)</i> <i>(N.B.2 In more senior roles, the emphasis might be on supporting and developing colleagues)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • role modeling leadership values • using a coaching approach to engage with colleagues • contribution to promoting an environment of equality, trust respect and co-operation • contribution to working collaboratively • actively seeking and acting on feedback from colleagues • demonstrating continuous improvement through, for example, reviewing module or programme handbooks, enrolment, recruitment, admissions or the curriculum and the impact this has had • establishing and maintaining career development through training and development activities (e.g. mentoring, PDR reviewing, research grant writing, peer review of teaching) • mentoring and developing colleagues • Successful completion of Research Integrity training in the last 3 years
<p>Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a full-time Equivalent basis. To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output. For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity. • Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University's strategic priority is indicated in bold. 			

Academic Career Pathways

Core Criteria – Research

Criteria	Indicative Performance Level	Examples
<p>1. <u>Research Outputs and Activity</u></p> <p>Disseminating research findings through appropriate written, oral or other media both internally and externally to the University.</p>	<p>Two publications of quality in 5 years</p>	<p><i>Demonstrate the personal contribution and impact of your research and/or innovation finding(s) and your specific role in the described impact. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • publications and/or other output – in the public domain – e.g. peer-reviewed reviews, scholarly text books/chapters, articles, collective volumes, editions of texts, translations, creative works, websites, datasets, policy papers/documents/guidelines, research reports, software at a standard appropriate for that of the academic discipline
<p>2. <u>Research Projects and Grants</u></p> <p>Securing the resources necessary to underpin research activity, with success as appropriate to the discipline.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Demonstrating involvement in effective postgraduate</p>	<p>Evidence of external research resources secured relevant to the discipline over a 5 year period, such as those indicated in the example box.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Acting as part of a supervisory team of a PGR student over a 5 year period.</p>	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the types of resources can vary, depending on the discipline and can be achieved either independently or in collaboration with others • independent or substantial contributions to the award of research support funding or other acquisition of resources required to complete research • securing access to a library or special collection, obtaining travel grants, funding to stage a performance or exhibition, setting up a network, capturing of Public Engagement with Research (PER) funding/activity with research projects • evidence of the successful execution of a research project

	research student supervision.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments in relation to your specific contribution to multi-applicant grants, e.g. in the application stage and delivery of the grant • evidence of contributing to supervising or second supervising postgraduate research, PhD, MRes students • evidence of supervision, joint or second supervision of postgraduate dissertations, theses and projects
3.	<u>Esteem</u> Contributing to the wider academic community with demonstrable impact and recognition from internal and external sources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of supporting the relevant professional community • One presentation at a conference, seminar or workshop with external reach/impact per year over a 5 year period. 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presenting at conferences, workshops and other fora (internal and external) in the UK and, where appropriate, abroad • engagement with public-facing bodies, e.g. BBC Documentaries, museums, science/arts festivals • engagement with policy bodies, e.g. Commissions, Parliamentary Committees, Non-Governmental Organisations • developing submissions/activities/outputs for public engagement with the University, e.g. Swansea Science Festival/Famelab/Oriel/Science Cafe/Research as Art • Acting as a member of an external funding award panel, as an external examiner for Postgraduate students, scholarly review
<p>Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a full-time Equivalent basis. To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output. For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity. • Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University's strategic priority is indicated in bold. 			

Academic Career Pathways

Core Criteria – Teaching

	Criteria	Indicative Performance Level	Examples
1.	<p><u>Teaching Delivery</u></p> <p>Contributing to courses within the taught portfolio, reviewing and updating own course materials and delivering sessions using the most appropriate mode of delivery.</p> <p>This includes ensuring that L&T policy and procedures are adhered to.</p> <p>Development and delivery of teaching to the appropriate standard. Assessment and quality assurance of components of the taught portfolio, within the academic unit.</p> <p>Taking part in course/module and programme development.</p> <p>Contribution to the Student Experience and Employability.</p>	<p><u>Delivery</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of positive impact of teaching on University KPIs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – improved progression/retention – academic mentoring – successful module outcomes, as in number of 1st, 2.1s, reducing module failure rate • Module Feedback Scores for Student Module Feedback Questions 1, 2 and 3 of at least the lower quartile value averaged over a 3 year period. • Evidence of successful student project supervision (showing number of students supervised, supporting them through the research process). 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <p><u>Delivery</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comments regarding volume and range of teaching • reflection on response rates to student feedback • development of new courses that have attracted students • acting as a module co-ordinator • taking responsibility for a particular Undergraduate module, reviewing and updating the module/parts of module or creating new module • working with other members of the programme team to improve governance and delivery of the programme • evidence of engagement with the student body to increase participation in student feedback and enhance the student voice • ensuring that the content and materials are up to date including learning outcomes, module plan, teaching materials, assessment planners and module teaching strategy • teaching is underpinned by the latest/current understanding as appropriate to the level of students based on research/scholarship in the field and draws directly on this link • ensuring effective assessment, clearly linked to the curriculum, with appropriate turnaround of marks and feedback to students, meeting agreed deadlines for return of feedback

	<p>Responding to feedback</p> <p>Engaging with the programme team</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of successful feedback from professional learners. • Evidence of pro-actively seeking feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • designing and delivering own teaching using appropriate style/method to meet the identified learning objectives • successful supervision of project students for undergraduate or postgraduate taught degrees • evidence of being an effective academic mentor (evidence might include withdrawal and retention rates at programme level, number of tutees, support with employability activities, widening access & participation) • preparing and delivering CPD to professional learners and receiving and acting on feedback • receiving positive feedback from students (e.g. module evaluation, meetings with students, online evaluation through student feedback surveys)
--	---	--	---

<p>2. <u>Personal Teaching and Improving Practice</u></p> <p>Demonstrating awareness of current research and innovation activities in the field and integrating this into teaching by developing practice in the light of this activity.</p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Responsibility for working with others to advance teaching practice.</p> <p>Note: This criterion focuses on your contribution and impact on either your own teaching and students or the teaching practice of your colleagues and their students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful implementation of improvements in teaching. • Evidence of ongoing personal development via CPD over the last three years and evidence of its impact on teaching. <p>AND/OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of contribution to School, Subject or Department teaching development over the last three years and evidence of its impact on teaching • Evidence of feedback from peers. 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement in CPD activities, such as peer review, workshops, professional development courses that have led to an enhancement in your own teaching practice • actively engaging in reviewing and developing provision • adapting teaching delivery and content appropriately in the light of formal and informal feedback received • putting forward ideas to improve and update a particular course in order to make it more attractive to students • bringing material up to date to fit current policy content and professional body requirements • adapting work in the light of comments from external examiners or peers • innovation in teaching methods and assessment of that innovation • revising teaching to ensure that it is relevant to the whole student experience to take account of employability or widening access issues • giving consideration to any particular needs of international students/ disabled students / non-traditionally qualified / non-traditional students when providing teaching • contributing to Faculty/School/Department teaching development • disseminating good practice to others • engaging positively in the peer observation process • involvement in reviewing teaching approaches or module/programme curricula • contribution to School Review progress • attendance at a conference, which has led to an enhancement in teaching practice
--	--	---

			Further examples of teaching innovation can be found on the SALT website
3.	<u>Professional Recognition</u> Undertaking and completing a professional teaching qualification.	Holding or actively working towards and obtaining HEA Fellowship or equivalent as recognised by HESA. (Please see definition of “working towards” in appendix C)	<i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fellowship of the HEA or working towards HEA Fellowship or equivalent e.g. the AOME (Medical Educators Recognition) • undertaking and completing a recognised teaching qualification such as the accredited Teaching in Higher Education qualification (tHE) course, PGCE or another recognised professional teaching qualification • peer recognition in the discipline • participating as an external examiner • ELTA and other teaching awards
Please note: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a full-time Equivalent basis. To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output. For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity. • Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University’s strategic priority is indicated in bold. 			

Academic Career Pathways Enhanced Criteria – Research

	Criteria	Indicative Performance Level	Examples
1.	<u>Research Outputs and Activity</u> A record of research outputs and their dissemination in quality publications or other media.	At least four 3* outputs over a 5 year period.	<p><i>Demonstrate the personal contribution and impact of your research and/or innovation finding(s) and your specific role in the described impact. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comments regarding the publication quality score (0-12)*, particularly where a publication is at a threshold between one level and another • evidence of a sustained contribution to a research area and a capacity to influence that area • a record of regular publication of original research (publication of monographs and books in peer-reviewed publications in internationally recognised journals, contributions to edited volumes, scholarly editions, catalogues, major research databases and outputs in media appropriate to the discipline) • other evidence that would indicate quality of publication, such as quality of the journal, publisher, as appropriate to the field • a record of at least one of the following relevant to discipline e.g. Adoption of Open Access dissemination processes and routes; Contributions to Open Source software, large scale computing projects, study materials, pre-registering study protocols, release of publicly accessible data in its many forms <p>*Contact your REF Officer for further information regarding publication quality score (0-12)</p>

2.	<u>Research Projects and Grants</u> Success in securing resources to underpin research activity with responsibility for designing, planning and managing a sustained programme of research and of conducting original investigations within agreed timescales and budgets.	Applications for research grants as Co-Investigator with at least one successful award within 3 years.	<i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • responsible for a research project or a significant part of a large project, from inception to completion • evidence of awards of funding bodies for resources to carry out research e.g. UK RI, EU, charities or business as appropriate to the discipline • evidence of the application of appropriate methodologies to address the research project • Comments in relation to your specific contribution to multi-applicant grants, e.g. in the application stage and delivery of the grant
3.	<u>Esteem</u> Demonstrating annual growth that within 5 years there will be recognition for contribution to the discipline through making a personal contribution on research developments.	Presenting contributions at conferences, workshops, seminars and other appropriate events. At least one presentation with a national or international reach per year over a 5 year period.	<i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • presentations at conferences, workshops and other fora • active Membership of appropriate Professional Body / Learned Society • participating in and setting up specialist groups • participating in or initiating collaborative research projects • participating in multi-disciplinary research teams • participating in international collaborations • recognition by academic or professional bodies, for example through awards, prizes, nominations etc

4.	<u>Postgraduate Research Student Supervision and Development</u> Demonstrating involvement in effective postgraduate research student supervision.	Part of a supervisory team of a current PGR student.	<i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some example areas are provided as guidance:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of contributing to supervising or second supervising postgraduate research, PhD, MRes students • evidence of supervision, joint or second supervision of postgraduate dissertations, theses and projects
<p>Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a full-time Equivalent basis. To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output. For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity. • Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University's strategic priority is indicated in bold. 			

Academic Career Pathways

Enhanced Criteria – Teaching and Scholarship

	Criteria	Indicative Performance Level	Examples
1.	<p><u>Teaching Delivery</u></p> <p>Effective delivery of the teaching, assessment and quality assurance of modules or other equivalent components of the taught portfolio.</p> <p>Reviewing course content and materials, and developing, designing and updating materials in compliance with quality standards.</p>	<p><u>Delivery</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of impact of teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – improved progression/retention – academic mentoring • Module Feedback Scores for Student module feedback questions 1, 2 and 3 of at least the lower quartile value averaged over a 3 year period • Responsibility for a number of Undergraduate modules, reviewing and updating the module/parts of module or creating new modules within 3 years. • Evidence of successful student project supervision (showing number of students supervised, supporting them) 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <p><u>Delivery</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • comments regarding volume and range of teaching • reflection on response rates to student feedback • contributing to a team delivering high quality teaching as evidenced by positive feedback received from students, colleagues, external examiners • development of new courses that have attracted students • acting as Module Co-ordinator/Leader for several modules or as Head of Year • responsibility for a number of Undergraduate modules, reviewing and updating the module/parts of module or creating new module • updating modules in light of new findings or developments within the discipline and having discussion topics around new research within the module • successful supervision of project students for undergraduate and postgraduate taught degrees • evidence of being an especially effective academic mentor (evidence might include withdrawal and retention rates at programme level, number of tutees, support with employability activities, widening access & participation)

		<p>through the research process).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of successful feedback from professional learners. • Evidence of pro-actively seeking feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • preparing and delivering CPD to professional learners and receiving and acting on feedback • evidence of engagement with the student body to increase participation in student feedback and enhance the student voice • evidence of contributing to supervising or co-supervising postgraduate research, PhD, MRes students • receiving positive feedback from students (e.g. module evaluation, meetings with students, online evaluation through student feedback surveys)
2.	<p><u>Personal Teaching and Improving Practice</u></p> <p>Teaching practice informed by own or others' research or informed by personal practice.</p> <p>This includes (i) the teaching activities which the individual engages in, and (ii) content of the teaching which the individual imparts being up-to-date knowledge.</p> <p>Note: This criterion focuses on your contribution and impact on your own teaching and your own students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Successful implementation of teaching improvement with evidence of positive change • Evidence of ongoing personal development via CPD over the last three years and evidence of its impact on teaching. 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involvement in CPD activities, such as peer review, workshops, professional development courses that have led to an enhancement in your own teaching practice • evidence of responding to student, peer or external examiner feedback • improving and updating courses in order to make them more attractive to students • implementing innovative evidence-based practice in teaching • professional body mapping recognition within 3 years • giving consideration to any particular needs of international students/ disabled students / non-traditionally qualified / non-traditional students through inclusive teaching and assessment <p>Further examples of teaching innovation can be found on the SALT website</p>

3.	<p><u>Professional Recognition</u></p> <p>Success in contributing to the wider academic community with demonstrable impact and recognition from internal and external sources.</p> <p>Contribution to institutional teaching impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fellowship of HEA or equivalent. • Evidence of contribution at Faculty/School/Department and/or institutional level. • External recognition via specialist role. 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of contribution to quality assurance or quality enhancement, for example through membership of institutional or Faculty/School/Department working group or sub-committee • fellowship of the Higher Education Academy/PGCtHE or equivalent; or other HE teaching qualification • evidence of commitment to working in an External advisory capacity in relation to teaching and quality for example as an External Examiner, subject specialist or external reviewer • evidence of successful publication or presentation on pedagogic practice, curriculum design or teaching innovation • recognition for teaching excellence through awards, prizes or nominations • At least 1 publication and 1 conference presentation in a 3 year period
4.	<p><u>Advancing Practice of others</u></p> <p>Responsibility for advancing teaching practice of others.</p> <p>Note: This criterion focuses on your contribution and impact on the teaching practice of your colleagues and the students of your colleagues.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academy contribution (workshop/champion/conference) within 3 years. • Submitting an application for L&T funding within 3 years. • Evidence of contribution to School, Subject or Department teaching 	<p><i>Demonstrate, using a reflective approach, your personal contribution, the scale and the impact of what you have done. Some examples areas are provided as guidance:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • contributing to developing colleagues' practice at subject or Faculty/School/Department level • engaging with subject educational networks or associations • evidence of application for and successfully securing internal or external funding for learning and teaching projects • engaging positively in the peer observation process

		development over the last three years and evidence of its impact on teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • reviewing teaching approaches or module/programme curricula • contribution to School Review progress
<p>Please note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a full-time Equivalent basis. To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output. For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity. • Where there is more than one Indicative Performance Level, the University's strategic priority is indicated in bold. 			

Academic Career Pathway Indicative Performance Levels

Indicative Performance Levels have been calculated on a Full Time Equivalent basis.

To ensure transparency, consistency and inclusivity, expectations must be realistic with regards to quantity of output.

For those working on a part-time contract these levels must be calculated pro-rata. Staff that have individual circumstances should also have the opportunity to share the impact of these on their activity.

Appendix A - Research

Research Outputs

A rolling 5-year total number of publications with a recorded star rating. The year is defined as a calendar year, i.e. 1st January to 31st December.

Please note that at present, publications shown within the PDR are only those that are:

- i. Recorded on the University Research Information System (RIS) and
- ii. Have been assessed through REF 2014 and subsequent mini-REF exercise(s)

Indicative levels are as follows:

Core Research

Number of publications
2 x publications of quality

Enhanced Research

Role	Number of publications
Lecturer	4 x 3*
Senior Lecturer	4 x 3*
Associate Professor	3 x 3* 1 x 4*
Professor	2 x 3* 2 x 4*

Please note that where it has been confirmed that a paper will be/has been submitted to REF as a double weighted publication, this will be counted as two

1. Grant Income

A 5-year rolling average of the value of the grant income awarded.
 The year is defined as the academic year, i.e. 1st August to 31st July.

How is this calculated?

Indicative performance levels are arrived at by identifying the range between the respective quartiles of the following datasets for each department;

- i. The 2014/15 Research Income in the HESA Finance Return for the institutions in the University Benchmark Group (UBG), for each subject
- ii. 3 year average of Swansea University (SU) Research Income at department level

Indicative levels are as follows:

Core Research

No indicative level for grant income obtained.
 Evidence of external resources secured relevant to the area over a 5 year period, such as those indicated in the example box.

Enhanced Research

Role	Grant income
Lecturer	No indicative level for grant income obtained. Applications for research grants as Co-Investigator. At least one award within 3 years.
Senior Lecturer	The award should be between the SU Lower Quartile and UBG Lower Quartile for PI and/or CoI activity (as illustrated in the metrics below).
Associate Professor	The award should be between the SU Median and the UBG Median for PI activity only (as illustrated in the metrics below).
Professor	The award should be between the SU Upper Quartile and the UBG Upper Quartile for PI activity only (as illustrated in the metrics below).

Grant Income ACP 2016	Professor		Associate Professor		Senior Lecturer	
	UQ		Med		LQ	
	Swansea	UBG	Swansea	UBG	Swansea	UBG
Engineering	141	124	57	107	22	81
Sports Science	64	37	23	16	18	15
Mathematics	5	39	2	30	1	22
Computer Science	166	86	37	73	3	46
Physics	156	177	18	129	4	95
Geography	82	51	32	35	9	24
Biosciences	46	121	15	80	9	69
Medicine	231	169	78	143	7	83
Health Science	87	37	13	29	2	27
Psychology	29	74	18	51	8	30
Social Work and Social Care	180	46	41	38	16	15
History	31	22	7	13	1	7
Classics	49	30	26	8	3	4
English Literature & Creative Writing	4	12	0.4	7	0.2	3
English Language	4	12	0.4	7	0.2	3
Modern Languages	7	21	2	6	1	4
Department of Media Studies	7	13	4	4	0.3	1
Political and Cultural Studies	72	23	17	16	2	6
Education	72	23	17	16	2	6
Department of Welsh	29	21	15	6	0	4
Law	6	10	2	7	0.9	2
Criminology	40	46	37	38	33	15
Accounting and Finance	48	12	26	8	3	5
Business	5	12	4	8	3	5
Economics	57	15	50	8	39	3

**University
Benchmark
Group**

**Swansea
University Data**



Note: The indicative grant income is the total grant amount over the last 5 years, divided by 5 to give the annual average amount as shown in this table.

Uses HESA 2014-15 data and internal data 2012-13 to 2014-15 (includes ERDF and ESF funding)

2. PGR Supervision

This is the number of PGR students supervised during the academic year by first and second supervisor status.

Indicative levels are as follows:

Core Research

No indicative level for PGR supervision as a first or second supervisor (included as part of Core Research Projects and Grants criterion)

Enhanced Research

Role	PGR Supervision
Lecturer	No indicative level for PGR supervision as a first or second supervisor. Part of a supervisory team of a current PGR student.
Senior Lecturer	At least 1 current student as first or second supervisor, as part of a record of PGR supervision and completion, including PhD
Associate Professor	Successful completion of at least 1 PhD or professional doctorate (as appropriate to the discipline) student as first supervisor in a 5 year period and typically acting as first supervisor for at least 1 PGR student per year, as part of a sustained record of postgraduate research student supervision and completion (including PhD).
Professor	Successful completion of at least 2 PhD or professional doctorate (as appropriate to the discipline) students as first supervisor in a 5 year period and typically acting as first supervisor for at least 2 PGR students per year, as part of an extensive and sustained record of successful postgraduate research student supervision and completion (including PhD).

Appendix B – Teaching & Scholarship

Module Evaluation

The average score of responses across all modules coordinated or taught for the module feedback questions:

1. Feedback on my work so far has helped to improve my learning
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the module
3. Overall I am satisfied with my experience of this lecturers teaching on this module

How is this calculated? The indicative performance levels are calculated by analysing the distribution of the score for the questions for each employee role. Quartile data was chosen to inform the minimum levels.

Indicative levels are as follows:

Core Teaching

ACP 2016	
Module Evaluation Questions	Lower Quartile (25%)
1. Feedback on my work so far has helped to improve my learning	3.8
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the module	3.9
3. Overall I am satisfied with my experience of this lecturers teaching on this module	4.0

Uses Internal 2015-16 data

Enhanced Teaching & Scholarship

ACP 2016	Professor	Associate Professor	Senior Lecturer	Lecturer
Module Evaluation Questions	Upper Quartile (75%)	Median Quartile (50%)	35 percentile (35%)	Lower Quartile (25%)
1. Feedback on my work so far has helped to improve my learning	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.8
2. Overall, I am satisfied with the quality of the module	4.7	4.3	4.0	3.9
3. Overall I am satisfied with my experience of this lecturers teaching on this module	4.8	4.5	4.2	4.0

Uses Internal 2015-16 data

Note: the 35th percentile is between the lower quartile (25%) and the median (50%).

Appendix C – HEA

Indicative levels are as follows:

Core Teaching

Holding or actively working towards and obtaining HEA Fellowship.

There are two routes for obtaining HEA Fellowship. “Actively working towards HEA Fellowship” is recorded as either of the following:

Route	Actively working towards HEA Fellowship
i. PG Certificate in Higher Education	A person is considered to be working towards Fellowship if he/she has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Pass for module SL-M01 • At least 2 Components above the Pass Mark for module SL-M02
ii. Accreditation	A person is considered to be working towards Fellowship ^[1] if he/she has completed the activities of the SALT Online Learning Object regarding HEA Fellowship and the UKPSF and has submitted a draft of their Fellowship application to SALT.

Enhanced Teaching

Role	HEA
Lecturer	Fellowship of HEA or equivalent.
Senior Lecturer	Fellowship of HEA or equivalent.
Associate Professor	Senior Fellow of the HEA, or equivalent or nominated for National Teaching Fellowship.
Professor	National recognition for excellent teaching/strategic impact for example as Principal Fellow of the HEA or a National Teaching Fellowship, or shortlisted for National Teaching Fellowship

Queries on what is equivalent can be raised with [SALT](#) in the first instance. If deemed as equivalent, written confirmation from SALT can be included as evidence.

^[1] The Term ‘Fellowship’ means all categories of Fellowship supported by the SAR route – Associate, Fellow or Senior Fellow