

Performance Management & Development System (PMDS) – School of Education

The purpose of this document is to specify the workload norms appropriate to academic staff working in the School of Education at NUI Galway. These are to be understood in the context of the School of Education's Operational Plan and defined competencies in the context of one's academic role. The aim of specifying these norms is to help staff identify academic activities relevant to preparing their individual workload profile and drafting a workload plan.

In the spirit of the University's PMDS Guidelines for Academic Staff, the School of Education PMDS exercise should encourage excellence in research, learning and teaching, and contribution to the wider community. It should clearly support career progression, recognise achievements, and review development against agreed performance targets relative to Departmental 'norms'. The PMDS review should be undertaken in a fair, respectful, supportive way with attention to equality, and consistency; there should be no surprises.

A copy of the University's guidelines on PMDS and Work Load Model (WLM) can be found at:

<http://www.nuigalway.ie/media/stafftraining/PMDSWLM-20-03-13.pdf>

PMDS Review forms can be found at:

<http://www.nuigalway.ie/staff-development/performancemanagement/pmsreviewforms/>

These norms, developed in several iterations by staff in 2013 and 2014, and by a Workload Committee in February 2015, based on benchmark models from other university departments (Psychology, and Nursing and Midwifery) and in consultation with the wider School, represent an attempt to create a transparent set of guidelines by which to evaluate academic performance. The School of Education workload norms described here are, almost by definition, based on averages. More specifically, they are explicitly based on the Academic Activity Profile (AAP) fractions of 0.4 teaching, 0.4 research, 0.2 contribution (see page 3 of the PMDS and WLM Guidelines for Schools document link above).

In reconciling these performance norms with the personalised nature of individual workload planning and performance evaluation, careful consideration of the specific roles and responsibilities of each member of the academic staff will be required. In particular, it will be important that staff whose activities are particularly focused in one area (whether teaching, research, or contribution) will have that activity appropriately recognised. Therefore, while these norms have an important role in articulating expectations for workload and performance, *targets are aspirational rather than binding, and the exercise starts from the understanding that staff should be meeting expectations.*

Finally, it is expected that these workload norms will require review and re-evaluation. This will be particularly important for addressing the fact that many activities, research activities specifically, can only be accurately evaluated over a 2-3 year period. The committee explicitly acknowledges that there will be a need for further iterations of these norms.

Document prepared by Veronica McCauley, Kevin Davison, and Mary Fleming, on behalf of the Workload Committee.

Workload Norms and PMDS Contribution Ratings – RESEARCH

Five domains of research were identified. Each domain has a number of indicators which are acknowledged as important research-related activities within the School.

1. Publications
 - a. These may be: Article in a peer-reviewed journal, Article or chapter in a book; Book (whole); Book (Editor) as well as non-peer reviewed publications
 - b. Publications as senior or lead author will be distinguished from publications as co-author
2. Research funding
 - a. Principal investigator or co-applicant on external funding application.
 - b. PhD studentship funding as supervisor
3. Postgraduate research
 - a. Postgraduate supervision (PhD, M.Litt)
 - b. PhD Internal Examination
 - c. GRC activity
4. Networking and Collaboration
 - a. Organisation of national or international conferences
 - b. Presentations (including oral/poster presentations, workshops and symposia) at national conferences
 - c. Presentations (including oral presentations, workshops and symposia) at international conferences (within or outside Ireland)
 - d. Research Collaborations -Whole school project - CREATE –collaborator, lead, publications, NCE-NSTL-shared projects and others within the university or beyond
 - e. Research driven policy development inputting to EU or national government policies or non-governmental organisation policy.

The following indicators are considered markers of performance in Research in terms of originality, significance, and rigour

Indicator	Satisfactory performance (score of 2)	Performance exceeds expectation (score of 3)
<p>1. Publications</p> <p>2. Research funding</p>	<p>At least 1 publication as any author (senior or co-author) per year in a peer-reviewed journal/book (submitted/accepted/published) or</p> <p>An equivalent published peer-reviewed conference paper or</p> <p>2 or more non-peer reviewed publications</p> <hr/> <p>1 research funding application <u>submitted</u> or</p> <p>1 PhD/Postdoc studentship application <u>submitted (IRC or equivalent)</u> or</p> <p>1 successful minor** research funding award over the last two years</p>	<p>2+ publications per year, of which at least one being in a high impact journal (indicated by journal impact factor [IF > 1] in top decile for journal category according to ISI Journal Citation Reports)* or</p> <p>Any other very significant research output such as a book published with an international publisher</p> <hr/> <p>1 successful PhD studentship (IRC or equivalent) or</p> <p>Successful major** research funding award over the last two years</p>
<p>3. Postgraduate Research (<i>this does not include M.Ed. supervision as this is accounted for under teaching</i>)</p>	<p>Supervising at least 2 postgraduate students (PhD/M.Litt), and on at least 2 GRCs</p>	<p>Supervising at least 3 postgraduate (PhD/M.Litt), and on at least 3 GRCs</p> <p>or</p> <p>PhD Internal Examination</p>
<p>4. Networking and Collaboration</p>	<p>At least 1 conference/symposium presentation (oral, poster, or workshop) academic dissemination per year (national or international)</p>	<p>2 conference/symposium presentations (oral, poster or workshop)/ academic dissemination per year (national or international)</p> <p>Organisation of national or international conference</p>

	Active in one research collaborative group (SOE based, University based, National or International) which is focused on published outcomes and dissemination	Lead in a collaborative research group with measurable successful outcomes-publications, presentations, dissemination, etc (at least biannually)
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

* If it can be demonstrated that the journal is a leading journal in the field, an argument can be made to accept lower impact factor journals. A review of journals is being led by the SOE research committee

** A minor research funding award is generally considered as an award valued of less than €25,000; a major funding award is generally considered as an award valued at €25,000 or more.

Assuming the 40:40:20 ratio, The suggestion is that all staff who are post-PhD must successfully complete ‘one’ item from the ‘Core’ research menu in addition to any other item. Staff who have not completed their PhD will refer to their PhD write-up, as one element (we have yet to discuss if another element is a necessity for a score of 2 for staff who are writing their PhD, perhaps only for a score of 3? Further discussion required).

To earn an overall score of 2 (satisfies/meets expectations): A candidate should score at least 2 on **one item** in categories 1 or 2 (Core research category) **‘and’ one item** from categories 3 and 4, or equivalent.

To earn an overall score of 3 (exceeds expectations): A candidate should score at least 3 on **one item** in categories 1 or 2 (Core research category) **‘and’ one item** from categories 3 and 4, or equivalent.

The above performance descriptions are indicative and for guidance only. Other activities and accomplishments not specified here may demonstrate the achievement of performance in each category.

Workload norms and PMDS Contribution ratings – TEACHING

Grouped into 4 combined areas for norms

1. Teaching Responsibilities

This will include hours of class contact (can include MEd supervision, PME Practitioner Research Supervision, and Teaching Practice Supervision hours – see below).

2. Teaching Skills and Student Support

This may include the following: Evidence of appropriate assessment in all taught modules; Revision of practice; collecting student feedback collected on taught modules; student support and facilitation; development and implementation of teaching action plan (e.g., as response to external examiner feedback); M.Litt/Masters' Internal Examination

3. Professional Development and Scholarship

This may include the following: Evidence of a Teaching skills assessment (peer/external); Submitted for a University /equivalent teaching award/qualification in the past year.; evidence of attendance at 1 teaching-related workshop (may be research-focused where relevant); updated Teaching Portfolio; tested a teaching innovation; leadership and innovation in pedagogical practice; additional/exceptional teaching related performance.

4. Curriculum & Course Design/Development, innovation and leadership

This may include: Develop 1 new module (i.e., submit module outlines etc), Contributed to curriculum development at School level, Coordinating modules, Contributed to national/international guidelines on teaching & learning e.g. OECD, NCCA, Learning, Teaching and Assessment (LTA) strategy within NUIG.

The following indicators are considered markers of performance in Teaching in terms of volume, earning outcomes, and student support

Indicator	Satisfactory	Exceeding
1. Teaching Responsibilities	175 hours class contact ¹ (include at least 2 taught Masters ² supervision contact hours, 8 PME/MGO	200+ hours class contact

¹ Registrar stated 175 average teaching hours at Feb 2015 Staff board meeting; Nursing estimate 180-185 as norm, Humanities averages 150hrs. As such, in relation to AAP ratio, 10% equates to approx. 45 contact teaching hours

² 1 MEd dissertation students: 20 hours [10hrs meeting + 10hrs thesis reading & feedback]

	Practitioner Research ³ , and 8 TP students) ⁴	
2. Teaching Skills and Student Support	<p>2 of the following</p> <p>Evidence of revision of teaching approaches, materials and resources (more integrated use of mobile technologies, incorporating a new element in Bb, an email to students detailing how you are changing the course based on their feedback etc.)</p> <p>Evidence of appropriate assessment, feedback and support in all taught modules</p> <p>Very good or excellent student feedback collected on taught modules</p> <p>Development and implementation of teaching action plan (e.g., as response to external examiner feedback, teaching skill assessment and student feedback)</p> <p>Student support across programmes (e.g. IEP's in SEN & Practitioner Research, BME)</p>	<p>Achieves Satisfactory on Indicator 2 plus 2 of the following</p> <p>Substantial revision of teaching materials</p> <p>Evidence of collaborative enquiry research/partnership with a school(s) linked to TP supervision</p> <p>1 Supervised Student submits publication</p> <p>Evidence of mentoring at least 50% of supervised students to present at conferences (e.g., research seminars and ESAI)</p>

³ 1 PME Practitioner research student: 15 hours [1.5hrs over 3 tutorials per student + 13.5hrs review of project and feedback]

⁴ 1 TP Supervision Student: 10 hrs [3 hrs visit + 1 hr TP file review]; Also, recognition will be given in respect of travel time for Teaching Practice

<p>3. Professional Development and Scholarship</p>	<p>1 of the following</p> <p>Evidence of a Teaching skills assessment (peer/external)</p> <p>Evidence of attendance at 1 teaching-related workshop (may be research-focused where relevant)</p> <p>Evidence of innovative approach to teaching (eg. PBL, use of iPad, or technology to enhance teaching and learning)</p> <p>Any other relevant CPD activity</p>	<p>Achieves Satisfactory on Indicator 3 plus 2 of the following</p> <p>Excellent feedback from teaching skills assessment (peer/external)</p> <p>Completed teaching portfolio or Recipient of a University /equivalent teaching award/ qualification in past two years</p> <p>Conducted workshops for teaching or research skills</p> <p>Attracted national/international visibility relevant to teaching issues (e.g., newspaper articles, blogging about teaching-relevant issues)</p>
<p>4. Curriculum & Course Design/Development, Innovation & Leadership</p>	<p>2 of the following</p> <p>Develop 1 new module (i.e., submit module outlines etc)</p> <p>Contributed to curriculum development and/or programme review at School level</p> <p>Coordinated at least 1 module</p> <p>Contributed to School guidelines on best teaching practices</p>	<p>Achieves Satisfactory on Indicator 4 plus 1 of the following</p> <p>Develop new programme</p> <p>Show leadership in curriculum development (at programme level)</p> <p>Coordinated at least 2-3 modules</p> <p>Contributed to national/international guidelines on university teaching and learning</p>

	Evidence of mentoring others (staff and students)	
--	------------------------------------------------------	--

To earn an overall score of 2 (satisfies/meets expectations): Satisfy Indicator 1 and achieve a Satisfactory level in one more area (2, 3 or 4)

To earn an overall score of 3 (exceeds expectations): Satisfy Indicator 1 and achieve an Exceeding level in one more area (2, 3 or 4)

The above performance descriptions are indicative and for guidance only. Other activities and accomplishments not specified here may demonstrate the achievement of performance in each category.

Workload norms and PMDS Contribution ratings – ACADEMIC SERVICE & COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Four Domains of Academic Service and Community Engagement were identified. Each domain has a number of indicators which are acknowledged as important indicators of Service and Engagement activities with the School.

1. Leadership: School Committees , Roles and Co-ordination Tasks
 - a. Administration and management e.g. Course Director or co-ordination roles

2. College/University Committees
 - a. Contribution to the University community e.g. College or University committee activities.

3. Community Contribution (with students, schools, etc.)
 - a. Teacher continuing education (including public education and CPD initiatives) e.g. teaching activities that are not part of core undergraduate and postgraduate courses.
 - b. Civic and public life e.g. including advocacy, public outreach and working with NGOs & civic organisations or Trade Unions or third sector work.
 - c. Presentation of research to public/school groups/organisations, etc.

4. Professional Contribution
 - a. Contribution to professional bodies or disciplinary organizations e.g. contribution to professional or scientific societies (including peer reviewing for scholarly academic journals).
 - b. Organisation of major international events; e.g. research or practice based conferences.
 - c. Reviewing research funding applications or member of review panel for scholarships.
 - d. External PhD examination, Programme External examination

The following indicators are considered markers of performance in relation to Academic Service and Community Engagement in terms of University and wider community vitality, sustainability, and enhancement.

Indicator	Satisfactory performance (Meets Expectations score of 2)	Performance Exceeds Expectations (score of 3)
1. Leadership: School Committees , Roles and Co-ordination Tasks	Membership in a School Committees or School Administrative Roles or Academic Co-ordination tasks	Membership in 2 or more School Committees/School administrative Roles, or Academic Co-ordination tasks or Serving Lead function at School level e.g. Course Director, School Committee Chair, Working Group Leader, etc.
2. College/University Committees	Membership of at least 1 College or University Committee/ Working group etc	Serving Lead function e.g. College Committee Chair, Vice-Dean of College or Chair of College Project group/Working party /Policy group
3. Community Contribution (with students, schools, etc.)	Participation in at least 1 community activity which may include sharing research to the wider public, open days, inservice, CPD activity outside core teaching, activity with students, involvement with a voluntary group, or a talk to a community group/school	Participation in at least 3 community activities listed in the adjacent column. or Example of leadership or substantial involvement in a Community activity
4. Professional Contribution	Active participation in at least 2 professional activities or groups. This may involve education activities outside core teaching responsibilities	Active participation in at least 3 professional activities. This may involve education activities outside core teaching responsibilities.

	<p>or review of research funding, scholarships, etc. Might also include serving as reviewer for a scholarly journal</p> <p><u>or</u></p> <p>Sitting on a board of assessors for a new post</p>	<p><u>or</u></p> <p>Evidence of leadership or substantial involvement in profession e.g. editorship of peer reviewed journals , leader of working group/policy development, Scholarship Board of Assessors Chair, etc.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

To earn an overall score of 2 (satisfies/meets expectations): a staff member should score a 2 on two activities within and/or across the indicators above or reveal evidence of appropriate engagement in any of the categories.

To earn an overall score of 3 (exceeds expectations): a staff member should score a 3 on two activities within/or across all the indicators above or reveal evidence of substantial engagement in any of the categories.

The above performance descriptions are indicative and for guidance only. Other activities and accomplishments not specified here may demonstrate the achievement of performance in each category.