11

Peer Review in Academic Promotion of Excellent Teachers

Eva Forsberg, Sara Levander, and Maja Elmgren

Introduction

Promotion in academia is part of the academic reward system that comprises the many ways in which institutions and scientific fields value faculty. The reward system, which includes aspects of both merit and bias, is critical in how institutions recruit, sustain, assess, and advance faculty members throughout their careers (O'Meara, 2011). Reward systems and career structures are deeply entrenched in the national traditions of higher education systems and domestic labour markets. However, processes of convergence can be observed and, in many countries, recent reforms have addressed the management of faculty careers in somewhat similar ways (Musselin, 2005). In many countries, academic careers follow a rather formalized structure with more or less clearly delineated ranks for different stages (Musselin, 2010).

E. Forsberg (✉) • S. Levander • M. Elmgren
Department of Education, Uppsala University, Uppsala, Sweden
e-mail: eva.forsberg@edu.uu.se

Moreover, evaluations are a hallmark of scientific merit (Merton, 1968), and an evaluation machinery has now spread to almost every corner of the academic enterprise, reward systems included (Dahler-Larsen, 2015). In evaluation practices, gatekeepers maintain a powerful role in the recognition of scholars and institutions. Judgement by peers is the evaluation form *par excellence* in the academic field, although it has been challenged by managerialism (Musselin, 2013). Peer review is crucial in determining, for example, the reputation and status of scholars and the allocation of scarce resources and academic careers (Lamont, 2009).

Research merits have long been the priority in the recognition of institutions and scholars (Merton, 1968; Bourdieu, 1996). Teaching is often downplayed, appearing as a practice of less worth in academia (Van den Brink, 2010; Levander, 2017). To counteract this tendency, various systems to upgrade the value of education and promote teaching excellence have been introduced by higher education institutions on a global scale (O'Meara, 2011). Even though institutions differ in their centre of focus, most stress a multiple form of scholarship that includes the dual mission and nexus of research and teaching (Boyer, 1990; Elken & Wollscheid, 2016; Taylor, 2008; Tight, 2016). In recent decades, there has been a quest for excellence in academic scholarship, in terms of both research and teaching and public outreach. The moral qualities of academics can also be included in the evaluation of excellence (Lamont & Mallard, 2005). Nevertheless, excellence, like quality, often lacks both an external referent and internal content; it does not refer to a specific set of things or ideas (Readings, 1996). As an empty signifier (Laclau & Mouffe, 1985), excellence has gained support and general consent on the level of discourse.

Although excellence has come to serve as the meritocratic standard and currency, it is not a universally recognized, neutral, and objective gold standard. On the contrary, there is little consensus of what constitutes excellence, what it means, how it is achieved, and how it may be assessed (Lamont, 2009). Rather, it is a fuzzy socially constructed object that is contextual and relational, gaining its meaning by an array of actors in multiple practices and through various artefacts (Angermüller, 2010). In other words, the construction and conceptualization of excellence depends on where it is used, by whom, for what purposes, and in relation to what; different standards of excellence are employed in different contexts.

While there is a great deal of literature on teaching excellence in higher education—stretching from distinct conceptualizations of the phenomenon (Boshier, 2009; Boyer, 1990) to suggestions or imperatives on how to assess it in, for example, academic recruitment and promotion (Glassick et al., 1997; Paulsen, 2002; Ramsden et al., 1995)—there is less research on how it is manifested in academic promotion processes. Prior research on peer review of excellence in academia has primarily focused on research excellence in grant proposals and in manuscripts for publication in academic journals. Even though peer review has been a prominent object of study, particularly after 1990, empirical research has not addressed peer review in a comprehensive way. In particular, comparatively few studies analyse peer review in the promotion of teaching excellence and the texts that are interchanged in these processes (Sabaj Meruane et al., 2016; Batagelj et al., 2017). Thus, we know little about the manifestation of teaching excellence in peer review in distinct academic promotion systems. In this respect, this chapter provides a substantial contribution to the extant research on peer review.

In this chapter, we explore the values and beliefs that are unveiled in the promotion of academics when teaching excellence is under scrutiny. We employ empirical data collected within the research project titled *Academia, Scholar Proficiency, and Career Systems*—more specifically, from an inquiry into the promotion of excellent teachers to the level of ‘distinguished university teacher’,¹ at a broad research-intensive comprehensive university in Sweden. Due to the principle of public access to official records, the documents in promotion processes are easily accessible for research purposes. While contextual factors such as national regulations, institutions’ academic profiles, and academic evaluative cultures are critical for the specific meaning reviewers ascribe to teaching excellence, the evaluation processes of academic scholarship are of interest beyond the specific context. Moreover, the tendencies of convergence of higher educational systems require an understanding of specific national circumstances (Hamann, 2019).

In many respects, peer review in the promotion of teaching excellence is similar to other evaluations of academic performances; however, there

¹ ‘Distinguished university teacher’ is the official term of this rank at the university in question.

are also significant differences. We argue that the peer review process is mainly framed by the national and institutional context, the particular career and reward system, the type of appointment (promotion), and the specific object of evaluation (teaching excellence). Moreover, the intersection between promotion, peer review, and excellent teaching affects both the peer review process and the notion of the ‘distinguished university teacher’. Furthermore, the institutionalization of this promotion practice is embedded in the tension between standardization and professional judgement. Like many other evaluation practices, the promotion process is a high-stakes activity characterized by uncertainty and risk.

The chapter proceeds as follows: first, promotion to the level of ‘distinguished university teacher’ will be contextualized as part of the career and reward structure within the Swedish higher education sector. We then analyse the framework of regulation and division of responsibilities between the agents involved in the promotion process at the particular university under study (the ‘case university’). Next, we employ guidelines, applications, and reviewers’ assessments to illustrate the meaning-making of distinguished university teaching. Special attention is paid to the reviewers’ judgement and to their legitimization of their judgement. In the final section, we discuss the institutionalization of the notion of an excellent teacher as manifested in the (e)valuation process of ‘distinguished university teachers’.

Career and Reward Structure in Swedish Higher Education

Although most higher education institutions in Sweden are public, they vary in size, in specialization, and in the balance between the resources allocated for research and teaching. They also differ in that universities are granted general degree-awarding powers at the second and third cycle levels, while university colleges must apply for them. The same basic legislation is valid for all Swedish higher education institutions (Swedish Govt. Bill, 2009/2010, 80). Thus, there is now some diversity in the career and reward structure, although there are still major similarities regarding the most fundamental categories.

According to national statistics, senior lecturers and lecturers make up about 30 and 15 per cent, respectively, of the research and teaching staff in the higher education system. The share of academics with professorship—the highest position a teacher or researcher can achieve—amounts to roughly 20 per cent. There are also permanent positions as researchers. Within these positions, fixed-term employments are relatively common (approximately 30 per cent), including qualification positions and positions as a researcher, visiting professor, adjunct teacher, or substitute teacher. Qualification positions include associate senior lecturer, postdoc, and postdoctoral research fellow. There is an increasing trend in the number of positions requiring a PhD (UKÄ, Swedish Higher Education Authority, 2019).

The most common procedure for appointing positions at a higher education institution is that teachers are to be appointed in competition, assessed by expert reviewers who must pay the same amount of attention to the assessment of research as to the assessment of teaching expertise. Unless it is manifestly unnecessary, expert reviewers are expected to be used for the appraisal of a professor. The positions of professors and senior lecturers and the qualification position of an associate senior lecturer are regulated by the state in the Swedish Higher Education Act (SFS, 1992:1434). Beyond these, each institution can decide what teacher categories are to be employed and how their career structure and guidelines for appointment and promotion are to be designed. As elsewhere (Höhle, 2014), a shift from a chair model to a department model can be observed in Sweden. While basic criteria of eligibility for senior lecturers and professors are still established at the government level in the Swedish Higher Education Ordinance (SFS, 1993:100), decisions on more elaborated criteria, and on criteria for the employment of other types of academic positions, are made at the institutional level.

There are three basic career structures in the Swedish higher education system (as detailed in Fig. 11.1), and they employ different denominations and levels of teaching excellence. The first career structure is the traditional ranking structure, which is mainly based on research expertise. The second is directly linked to the most common teaching positions—the mandatory professor and senior lecturer—in addition to the common teaching position of the lecturer, who is not required to have a PhD. The third is an emerging career structure similar to the system of

Fig. 11.1 The basic career structure in the Swedish higher education system. (Lecturer (USA: lecturer; SWE: *adjunkt*); Associate senior lecturer (USA: assistant professor; SWE: *biträdande lektor*); Senior lecturer (USA: associate professor; SWE: *lektor*); Professor (USA: full professor; SWE: *professor*); Reader (USA: associate professor; SWE: *docent*))

tenure and promotion that is employed in US universities, based on the fixed-term qualification position of associate senior lecturer.

It is possible for a candidate to be appointed to any teaching position without having held another teaching position before, although teaching expertise is required. Normally, the rank of reader is required for an appointment to professor. At many universities, a teacher may apply for a promotion from one teaching position to the next, while demonstrating the required expertise in research and teaching. In the three-track career structure presented in Fig. 11.1, there are several possible career paths. In the next section, we explore how the promotion to ‘distinguished university teacher’ in our case university is related to the Swedish higher education career and reward structure, and briefly comment on the promotion system and its guidelines.

Gatekeeping in the Promotion of ‘Distinguished University Teachers’

In 2010, the vice-chancellor of our case university decided on a university-wide reform in which teachers could apply to become appointed as ‘distinguished university teachers’, at a level clearly requiring a higher level of

proficiency than the level being demanded for recruitment (Guidelines for Admittance of Excellent Teachers). Thus, the admittance of ‘distinguished university teachers’ emerged as an additional, fourth career track (Fig. 11.2).

Criteria specifications were left to the faculty boards to decide on, in accordance with a decentralized collegial structure. Teaching qualifications should be documented and assessments should be performed by two reviewers, at least one of which must be external to the university and at least one of which must have scientific expertise in the same field as that of the candidate. The admitted teacher would receive a standardized salary increase.

Promotion processes at the university follow a formalized procedure. A requirement for admittance to ‘distinguished university teacher’ is permanent employment as a lecturer, senior lecturer, or professor. On the one hand, the rank of a ‘distinguished university teacher’ is on par with the rank of a reader. On the other hand, it is neither a part of the traditional career track nor a part of the tenure and promotion career track, both of which are based on possession of a PhD. Instead, teaching excellence is directly linked to either level of the teaching position career track (see Fig. 11.1). Each faculty board has elaborated guidelines within the institutional framework. According to these guidelines, there are no differences in the assessment of excellence based on the level of teacher position.

Career IV

Distinguished university teacher

Fig. 11.2 A fourth career track in the case university

The Process of Promoting Teaching Excellence

The process of promotion comprises several stages and involves different agents. Due to different structures within different scientific domains, the level of the faculty board involved may vary, and there are slight differences in the degree of delegation at different faculties. However, in general, a promotion committee prepares the recruitment and evaluation process, whereas the final decision is made by a faculty board. The promotion committees are standing committees, and the members are elected for a certain term of office. The entire process is illustrated in Fig. 11.3.

As shown in the figure, the process involves a number of gatekeepers, all of which are peers: the reviewers, the promotion committee, and the faculty board. These gatekeepers produce a number of documents: evaluation reports written by the reviewers, the proposal protocol from the promotion committee, and the final decision protocol from the faculty board/promotion committee. The faculty board plays a dual role in this process, since the board executes the local guidelines framing the whole process in addition to making the final decision, if the latter is not delegated elsewhere.

Fig. 11.3 The process of admitting excellent teachers at the university. (Lecturer (USA: lecturer; SWE: *adjunkt*); Associate senior lecturer (USA: assistant professor; SWE: *biträdande lektor*); Senior lecturer (USA: associate professor; SWE: *lektor*); Professor (USA: full professor; SWE: *professor*); Reader (USA: associate professor; SWE: *docent*)). In some cases, the faculty board delegates both the proposal and the decision to the promotion committee

The actual process starts when a candidate submits an application to the promotion committee. Then, the promotion committee selects two peer reviewers to assess the application. After the reviewers' evaluation reports are submitted to the promotion committee, the candidate may be invited to an interview and/or educational hearing. Drawing on the application, evaluation reports, interview, and educational hearing, the committee decides whether or not to nominate the candidate for admittance. Although the decision-making lies with the committee or the board, the reviewers have a crucial gatekeeping function and are key actors in this evaluation practice.

The qualification and selection of the gatekeepers are crucial to the making of the 'distinguished university teacher' in the promotion process. Faculty members on the board and committees are selected by and among scientifically qualified colleagues. In some committees, the members are themselves appointed as 'distinguished university teachers' or are considered to be especially proficient in pedagogical issues. To a varying extent, peer reviewers are chosen for their disciplinary expertise, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, or expertise in the evaluation of teaching proficiency. *Pari passu* with the national emergence of the possibility of rewarding excellent teaching is the establishment of a national course programme aiming to educate reviewers in the evaluation of teaching excellence. More and more academics are attending this course, and many of the reviewers involved in these assessments at the university have taken the course.

The Mandatory Content of the Application Dossier

As shown in Fig. 11.3, reviewers must base their assessments on the information compiled in the application dossier. The dossier normally includes a cover letter, a *curriculum vitae* (CV), and a teaching portfolio (Fig. 11.4).

In the portfolio, the candidates are expected to describe and reflect upon prior experiences in areas such as scope of teaching, management and development of teaching, the teaching-research nexus, and scholarly interaction. The candidates' teaching philosophy is also relevant—that is, their reasoning about their educational aims, views on teaching, learning

Fig. 11.4 Requested information to be included in the application dossier

theories, and so forth. It is important for candidates to provide concrete examples from practice that support their teaching philosophy and account of experiences. The portfolio should also contain various educational and teaching materials, such as a syllabus, assignments, lecture notes, and books, in order to strengthen the description and arguments made by the candidate. Moreover, a variety of testimonials, such as certificates, diplomas, student course evaluations, and attestations or affirmations from employers and colleagues, should be included in order to substantiate the excellence of the candidate. To support and guide the applicants and the reviewers' assessments, the faculty boards have developed local guidelines.

Faculty Guidelines and Candidate Applications

In this chapter, we draw on application cases from a teaching excellence reward system at a broad research-intensive comprehensive university in Sweden during 2013–2014. The data includes policy guidelines, full application dossiers, and the reviewers' evaluation reports. All three scientific domains are represented, and both admitted and rejected applications are included. The case university is divided into three scientific domains: *Humanities and Social Sciences* (HS), *Medicine and Pharmacy* (MP), and *Science and Technology* (ST). Three sets of guidelines are represented in our material, one for each domain. All guidelines include criteria, although these are elaborated in different ways regarding the aspects and examples of signs of fulfilment—that is, what kinds of indicators the applicants can point towards as evidence of their excellence. All sets of guidelines have in common an appreciation of extensive disciplinary

knowledge, broad experience from teaching at various levels and in different courses, a reflective practice in which the candidate analyses her or his own teaching and its outcomes, cooperation and discussions with colleagues, and educational administration. Collaboration and academic leadership are also emphasized, but not by every faculty. Some faculties expect all aspects to be fulfilled, while other faculties regard some aspects as added value. Moreover, the ST and MP faculties emphasize the teaching-research nexus, teaching-society nexus, and student progression, while the HS faculty stresses research activities, scientific production, research seminars, and conferences. While several types of testimonials are mentioned as evidence, it is worth noting that a standard for the level of excellence is not explicit in the guidelines. Both Boyer (1990) and O'Meara (2011) emphasize the reward system as a device for institutions, departments, and disciplines to differentiate among themselves and present their practices as unique. Within the promotion system of teaching excellence, there are no signs of such organizational judgements in the guidelines.

In the applications, candidates negotiate the guidelines when addressing reviewers as 'significant others' in the promotion process (Serrano Velarde, 2018). In alignment with the guidelines, the application dossiers in our study consist of portfolios with written reflections on the applicant's educational practice, as well as attachments with various testimonies, course evaluations, and examples, normally complemented with CVs. The candidates' reflections are mostly grounded in philosophical statements, typically based on both the educational literature and experience. Various examples of teaching practice, including supervision and examination, are reflected upon, often with some literature references and attachments. Furthermore, collegial cooperation and academic leadership are covered. In many cases, reflective practice is shown through the candidate's own teaching progress and thoughts on future development. The importance of the teaching-research nexus is often discussed, with disciplinary knowledge and research insights seen as foundations for teaching, occasionally with some mention of the consequences for the design of learning activities. Reciprocal learning and the role of students in academic discussions are sometimes mentioned; for example, one applicant wrote, 'Interaction with students at both undergraduate and

postgraduate levels has often meant that my research has been challenged and critiqued in interesting and at times unexpected ways'. In this chapter however, we focus on the evaluation reports written by peers.

Judgement and Legitimation in the Making of 'Distinguished University Teachers'

Recognizing excellent teaching is expedient for research on the interaction between reviewers, the object of the review (i.e. teaching excellence), and the context of the review (i.e. promotion). In addition, since attempts to promote the value of education and teaching excellence are evolving across the globe (O'Meara, 2011), early investigations may contribute to the improvement of these practices. As an emergent practice, the admittance of 'distinguished university teachers' involves insecurities regarding the prevailing norms of assessment. We may expect the various promotion texts to be more explicit about codified norms than in situations with more institutionalized evaluation practices. Informed by the sociology of valuation and evaluation (Beljean et al., 2015; Hamann, 2019), we are concerned with how value is produced and assessed in the promotion of teaching excellence. We illustrate the making of the 'distinguished university teacher' in promotion evaluations by analysing the archived records of peer review reports, while considering the guidelines and candidate applications mentioned above. We distinguish between two processes that are analytically distinct yet empirically intertwined (Hamann, 2019): *the reviewers' process of judgement*, in which value and qualities are ascribed to candidates and to excellent teaching and *the process of legitimation*, in which judgements are justified and made stable.

The (E)valuation of the 'Distinguished University Teacher': The Judgement

In the (e)valuation of the 'distinguished university teacher', the reviewers ascribe value to teaching excellence in distinct ways: by explicitly pointing to qualifications and competencies found in the application dossier

(referred to herein as ‘existentees’); by stressing missing aspects (‘absentees’); and by arguing some merits to be extraordinary (‘excellencees’). The reviewers draw not only on information in the application dossier, but also on the criteria and indicators of evidence stipulated in policy. The evaluation reports reflect the guidelines in terms of structure and criteria to a rather high degree. Thus, although the wording is mostly not the same, there is an explicit and strong intertextual relationship between the guidelines and the evaluation reports. In one case in the MP domain, the list of criteria with indicators is used as a checklist and the reviewer marks which criteria are fulfilled, or not fulfilled, without providing explicit justifications.

The Scholarly Judgement of Criteria and Content

Through the reviewers’ scholarly judgements, many aspects of teaching excellence are manifested. The most dominant criteria used are teaching skills, disciplinary knowledge, the teaching-research nexus, aspects of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning,² a holistic perspective, development over time, collaboration, and educational leadership. *Teaching skills* refer *inter alia* to high-quality teaching, supporting students’ multifarious development, constructive alignment, teaching and examination, and consideration of students’ differences and diversified experiences. *Disciplinary knowledge* and *the teaching-research nexus* are deeply intertwined. Disciplinary knowledge commonly refers to the depth and breadth of the candidate’s level of content knowledge, and is explicitly manifested as part of the nexus in some reports. The nexus is manifested

²The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning movement was first initiated by Boyer’s (1990) seminal work, in which he proposed four different forms of scholarship: discovery, application of knowledge, integration, and teaching. He argued for the recognition and reward of all four scholarships, *inter alia* to achieve greater alignment between academic staff rewards and institutional missions (O’Meara, 2006). Based on Boyer’s work, Glassick et al. (1997) stressed the importance of further assessment in order to enhance the value of other forms of scholarship in academia. Ideas about faculty conducting research on teaching and learning, excellence in teaching, the development of practice through reflection on theory and research, and experience-based knowledge on teaching (Kreber & Cranton, 2000) were later introduced as part of the notion. Furthermore, the basis for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is not just content and pedagogical knowledge, but also pedagogical content knowledge, as pointed out by Shulman (1986).

in various ways: through the candidate's content knowledge, undertaking of research, use of their own or others' research production, production of teaching materials (e.g. textbooks), and pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge.

Emphasis on the *aspects of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning* is also characteristic of this specific evaluation practice. Insights into educational research and the dissemination of practice-oriented research are included, along with examples from successful practice and development activities. In short, a research- and problem-based approach to the candidate's own teaching practice is emphasized. A *holistic perspective* refers to the candidate's ability to maintain progression throughout the teaching process and communicate the main thread to the students. The reviewers comment on the connection between current teaching and the overall education programme, and on the relationship among specific education, students' upcoming working life, and society in general. *Collaboration and development over time* concern communication and cooperation with students and colleagues regarding course design and development through, for example, the use of student course evaluations and discussions among peers. *Educational leadership* comprises positions and responsibilities such as (vice) head of department, director of studies, course management, and so forth.

The Scholarly Judgement of Evidence

Lists of merits (CVs), descriptions of prior teaching experiences and responsibilities, as well as commissions of trust (e.g. serving as faculty opponent or expert reviewer, and positions of authority) are common indicators to determine the fulfilment of criteria. Other commonly used indicators are testimonials such as certificates of continuing professional development (CPD) courses, records of publications and conference papers, support letters from management and colleagues, and student ratings of instructions and awards. However, testimonials *per se* are not always enough, as they must be put into context and be elaborated upon by the candidate. Furthermore, testimonials must include specific

information, because if there are ‘no motivations from either students or the head in the [certificate]... there are basically only statements and no material to assess or consider’. Hence, mere affirmation is not sufficient; testimonials should preferably also clearly account ‘for [the candidate’s] various contributions’.

Moreover, testimonials alone are insufficient evidence of excellence. The candidate’s self-reflection as a teacher and reflection on educational issues in a broader sense are indispensable for the distinguished title. Reflection on one’s own practice is one of the most dominant indicators of teaching excellence, both in terms of existentees and absentees. Existentees such as ‘[the candidate] reflects upon the relevance of the research for his teaching and how the research findings can be of use for the students’ are, for the most part, acknowledged by the peers. Absentees are equally often stressed:

[Teaching excellence] is in part demonstrated by some student course evaluations, one teaching award, and affirmations from the head of department. However, I lack clearer evidence regarding e.g. well described educational considerations, discussions about how the teaching works and first and foremost, why and with what result.

By request of some reviewers, reflections ought to be ‘developed in support of educational literature...’ and based on ‘extensive, practically pedagogical examples’. In turn, candidates who ‘illustrate ... with concrete examples as well as [their] own arguments, theoretically connected in a very illustrative and well-thought-out way’ are praised by the reviewers. Conversely, reviewers usually do not approve of excessive citations without reflection, nor of abstract reasoning without (some) references or tangible examples aligned with the rest of the portfolio. Moreover, some reviewers argue that it is ‘not enough to describe a successful achievement. Much more analysis and testing are required to meet the criteria for excellent teachers’. Thus, candidates are expected to problematize failures and unsuccessful attempts in an investigative approach, and discuss ‘what the educational problem was, how he solved it (and why), and what the outcome was’.

The same is true regarding aspects of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. It is not enough to participate in conferences; a discussion regarding 'the educational content of the many conferences and symposia' in which candidates partake is expected, and how this has affected the candidate's 'own and others' educational development'. It is stressed that this is not only for the sake of the portfolio, but also for the benefit of the community, as 'it would be of great value if these were distributed to colleagues through conferences, seminars, articles'. When the teaching materials support arguments such as '[the candidate] uses his own experiences from quantitative and qualitative methodology in his teaching', this is considered to be solid evidence of teaching excellence. Then again, teaching material with (according to the reviewers) misguided links to accounts in the portfolio or left uncommented may be seen as a token of a sloppy or hasty application, instead of being evidence of teaching excellence.

Although this focus of the assessments is mainly on quality, references to the level of quality are not very clear. Nevertheless, words and phrases such as 'impressive', 'excellent', 'prestigious', 'extraordinary', and 'extremely well qualified' indicate a high level of standard (excellencees). Such words are used to describe the fulfilment of several criteria and indicators, such as disciplinary knowledge, holistic perspective and reflection, educational leadership, and student course evaluations. Quantity and scope, such as 'massive teaching experience' or 'extensive experience of educational leadership from different levels', are also referred to, albeit primarily as a minimum level of qualification for teaching excellence or as being present in too-limited amounts. These are commonly referred to in a routine fashion, and are only given explicit value when related to reflection on action, developmental work, a successful outcome, and so forth.

To sum up, testimonials, reflections, and tangible examples from pedagogical practice are the most prevalent indicators of teaching excellence in our sample. However, each separate indicator is neither sufficient, nor decisive; rather, it is the combination of indicators and reflection upon them that matters.

Justification of the (E)valuation: The Legitimation

The nomination of a ‘distinguished university teacher’ requires not only the judgement of significant aspects of teaching excellence, but also the legitimation of these judgements. Justifications of the (e)valuations are made in several ways: through the formation of the promotion process, through the products involved and produced in the process, and through the ways in which the gatekeepers explicitly or implicitly argue their case.

Justification In-between Standardization and Professional Judgement

The promotion process is framed by institutional and faculty regulations, and is embedded in a national career structure of academic teachers. Following a process of faculty involvement, the university board decided to enlarge the reward system, and introduced the appointment of ‘distinguished university teachers’. In addition to institutional regulations, each faculty board laid down rules regarding several issues that were seen to be critical for the justification of the outcome: namely, the degree of decentralization of judgement and decision, the creation of guidelines, and the subsequent balance between standardization and professional judgement.

The introduction of the promotion system was partly motivated as a way to alter the balance between the primary values of a higher education institution: research and teaching. Two parties are directly involved in the appointment of ‘distinguished university teachers’: actors who distribute recognition (the faculty board) and those who receive it (the appointed teachers). However, interactional third parties are also involved in the process (Sauder, [2006](#)).

Peers, both internal and external, are involved in the formation of the promotion process and its outcome. Third-party factors that legitimate the judgements made include the promotion committees, which are composed of faculty colleagues who have been especially elected to manage and decide on the promotion of teaching excellence, and the selected peer reviewers. The question of who is considered qualified to serve as a

peer reviewer or as a member of the committee is critical for legitimization. Different values and weights are given to different reviewer qualifications. The legitimacy of peers is interchangeably based on disciplinary knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and expertise in the evaluation of teaching proficiency.

The construction of comparatively elaborated and explicit faculty guidelines with criteria, indicators, and even checklists can be regarded as a way to make the promotion process relatively transparent, to standardize the process of judgement, and thus to frame the interpretation, (e) valuation, and decisions made by peer reviewers and committee members. The introduction of this promotion system at the case university created an elite/non-elite level of distinction between the basic teaching competencies required in the recruitment of teachers and teaching excellence as demanded in the appointment of a 'distinguished university teacher'. Thus, as in all ranking systems, the exclusiveness of the rank is an overall legitimization of the promotion. Although criteria and indicators are stated in the guidelines, the level of the standard of excellence is less visible and is largely left to peer reviewers to establish.

Changes in status hierarchies are never easy, and are always a matter of struggle and power. Accordingly, the employment of colleagues is no guarantee of successfully redefining the status of teaching versus research. Merton (1996) sometimes used the notion of a 'compeer' to signal that academic practice is as much competitive as collaborative. In order to legitimate the academic promotion process and shift the balance in the valuation of teaching and research, the university and faculties under study chose to seek justification in-between standardization and professional judgement of peers. Moreover, the promotion in itself is legitimated through economic remuneration for the candidates and recognition for both individuals and organizations (Hamilton, 2019). Beyond the title and possible enhancement in status, it is less clear what the rank implies for the academic work of its holder. Similar to the appointment of readers, 'distinguished university teachers' are not automatically assigned new duties. However, there are ongoing discussions on this topic in the university and there have been some signs of professional implications. Furthermore, the 'distinguished university teacher' title is not

connected to a specific discipline. Thus, in a sense, it is a generic title that lacks a disciplinary foundation. Moreover, it has not been made clear whether the title is valid beyond the institution and the admitting faculty.

Justification Through Mandated Intertextuality

The justifications of the (e)valuations made by peer reviewers are mostly legitimated through explicit or implicit references to what is stated as mandatory or desirable in faculty board guidelines. Thus, the legitimization device *par excellence* in the promotion of ‘distinguished university teachers’ is justification through mandated intertextuality (Chen & Hyon, 2005). The reviewer report is required to interact with other documents; in particular, with guidelines and the criteria and indicators within them. These include formal judgements based on specified criteria, which allow the exclusion of candidates who are not formally qualified for the nomination (Hamann, 2019). Beside the existences of requested merits and performances, peer reviewers frequently refer to absentees—that is, what they consider to be missing. Overall, the reports legitimate and reflect key institutional processes and values within a framework that justifies itself through its aspiration for transparency and fairness, both procedural and distributional (see e.g. Mallard et al., 2009).

Generic and referential intertextuality are both present in the peer reviews (Devitt, 1991). Although the former is implicit, it can be discerned through statements responding to formal expectations as expressed in the guidelines. The latter is explicit and is present in the form of direct references to other texts. Guidelines are referred to most often, but other texts are also invoked, such as curriculum documents, teaching materials, research publications, conference presentations, and diverse forms of testimonials, indicating evidence of an applicant’s merits, performances, and achievements. Yet another form of intertextuality relates to the intersection of documents in the applicants’ dossier, the faculty guidelines, and the reviewers’ reports. Candidate and reviewer texts are linked through the guidelines and the candidates’ anticipation and knowledge of what they believe will be especially valued by the reviewer and committees.

Justification Through Scholarly Judgement

The promotion process is marked by standardization, and mandatory intertextuality is prevalent in the reviewer reports. At the same time, the peer reviewers negotiate and interpret criteria, indicators, and standards in their (e)valuation of the candidates' records. The reviewers argue their case through different types of scholarly judgement, which are omnipresent in the reports. In line with the guidelines, reviewers mainly focus on what to judge (i.e. criteria) and on evidence of required qualification and achievements (i.e. indicators); more rarely, they focus directly on the level of teaching excellence (i.e. standards) (Centra, 1993).

The level of detail varies across *criteria* in reviewer reports. In general, criteria are briefly stated; sometimes, however, the reviewers present short rationales that further specify aspects or indicators of a criterion. Often, these rationales are closely aligned with the explanations provided in the faculty guidelines. Commonly reflected themes in the reviewers' evaluations are teaching skills, disciplinary knowledge, the teaching-research nexus, aspects of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, a holistic perspective, collaboration, and leadership. The reviewers appear to consider continuous change and development in response to evaluation, feedback, and reflection to be fundamental. Less frequently mentioned themes include the aims and meaning of education, student diversity, out-of-campus teaching, the use of educational media, and innovative, outstanding, or original teaching. Moreover, these latter themes are conspicuous by their absence in both the guidelines and the reviewer reports.

The most popular *indicators* employed by peer reviewers in their judgement of candidate performances are various forms of testimonials. The reviewers also make use of concrete materials related to curriculum development and courses, when these are included by the applicants. Moreover, interviews and tests on teaching competence supplement the indicators applied by the reviewers to legitimate their judgements. Observation of regular teaching or student work is not part of the assessment. In addition, no metrics are used that refer to students' retention, performances, exams, employability outcome, and so forth. Metrics related to teacher products, such as education textbooks and articles, are not used either.

Explicit references to the level of *standard* (teaching excellence) are few. According to institutional guidelines, the level of teaching excellence is 'a higher level of teaching expertise /.../ clearly distinguished from the basic level' (UFV, 2010/1842, p. 1). In turn, this 'basic level' of teaching expertise is set in the requirements for the recruitment of permanent teachers—with permanent teacher being the only category eligible for admittance as 'distinguished university teacher'. Most reviewers indicate a higher level of teacher excellence through the specific value, weight, and significance they attribute to different criteria and indicators, as well as the relation within each category and between them. As an object of (e) valuation, the level of excellence emerges in the reviewer report primarily as a relational phenomenon. The level of excellence has both a qualitative and a quantitative foundation. According to the reviewers, the diversity and amount of the candidate's experiences, skills, and achievements, in addition to the evidence substantiating these, are paramount. In comparison with the level of basic teaching competencies, the reviewers expect the fulfilment of a larger number of aspects of various criteria or themes. In some faculties, all criteria and indicators must be satisfied; in others, some criteria or indicators add value but are not mandatory. Thus, reviewers collect information with an eliminatory function, which allows the reviewers to reject an applicant. The reviewers also search for positive signs of evidence, which might add together to reach the bar of excellence (Musselin, 2002).

Furthermore, the level of excellence is manifested in arguments that consist of a link between two elements, or a chain of such links. Reviewers repeatedly address how activities are executed; merely participating is not enough, regardless of how often participation occurs. Occasionally, reviewers are explicit about the quality of the performance, adding positive descriptions such as 'impressive' and 'extraordinary' to indicate the level of excellence. Experience with different kinds of teaching covering a diverse range of activities over time is also seen as fundamental. The link between teaching content and form and student achievements (i.e. subject—teaching—learning) is present, but not especially emphasized or elaborated. A more-or-less outspoken link is constituted between teaching and disciplinary knowledge (the teaching-research nexus). The teaching-outreach link is less visible. A recurrent line of argument from

the reviewers is related to the candidates' writing on teaching philosophy. The chain of links is often visualized through the identification of what reviewers judge to be left out or missing or, alternatively, to be statements without evidence. Candidates are requested to explore concrete teaching examples, preferably including student performances, course evaluations, and teaching reflections based on some kind of educational literature followed by curriculum development (activity—outcome—exploration—*theorizing—feedback—change*). This chain of practice-based teacher reflection operates as the prime gatekeeping function for the level of teaching excellence.

The Intersection of Promotion, Peer Review, and Teaching Excellence

Peer review emerged in modern science as a device to determine scientific quality and to allocate recognition among researchers. Nowadays, the practice of peer review has migrated and is employed in a number of evaluation practices. In this chapter, we have focused on a relatively new career track—the promotion of 'distinguished university teachers'—and identified the promotion process, involved actors, and products. The gatekeeping function of this process has been analysed in terms of judgement and legitimation. Through the former, the value and worth of different content, criteria, and indicators have been explored; through the latter, different forms of justification have been identified.

We infer that teaching competencies are ascribed with a somewhat different content and value in this specific evaluation practice, than in the recruitment of academic teachers in Sweden (see e.g. Levander, 2017; Levander et al., 2019). Reviewers relate to the criteria in policy to a greater extent, and largely highlight and discuss the many different aspects of educational proficiency, including the teaching-research nexus. In that respect, our findings do not fully support the misgivings of a disruption of teaching and research in academia due to teaching reward systems (Krause, 2009). Still, although the evaluation reports are more elaborated in these assessments, they display a rather homogeneous approach to the

assessment of teaching excellence. That is, the notion of teaching excellence turns out to be very similar, irrespective of discipline, the candidate's teaching position, and/or organizational belonging. Thus, the notion of teaching excellence is rather similarly and narrowly constructed across disciplines, and the approach to its assessment is relatively uniform. This, we conclude, may be explained by the institutionalization of this specific promotion process by means of the establishment of a national course for prospective reviewers and by means of the selection of reviewers.

We have demonstrated how the career and reward structure (the context of the evaluation), the promotion process (the evaluation in itself), and teaching excellence (the object of evaluation) is decisive for the peer review practice. Accordingly, we argue that the peer review practice is mainly framed by the national and institutional context, the particular career and reward system, the type of appointment, and the specific object of evaluation. The intersection of the promotion process, peer review, and teaching excellence affects the nature of guidelines, the selection of peers, the scope and specification of the outcome, and consequently the notion of the 'distinguished university teacher'. Furthermore, we argue that there is a tension between standardization and professional judgement in the institutionalization of the promotion process.

The Promotion of 'Distinguished University Teachers': The Same, But Different

Peer review in the promotion of 'distinguished university teachers' has both similarities and significant differences in comparison with other evaluation practices of academic performance. For decades, peers have been used in external and internal evaluations of teaching programmes and exams. Thus, the evaluation of teaching and teacher competencies is nothing new, nor is the use of peers in these processes.

Reviewer judgement and justification of the level of excellent teaching add an aspect to the evaluation of teaching, however. In addition, the primary focus on educational proficiency is novel, even though disciplinary knowledge and the teaching-research nexus are expected to be taken

into account. In contrast, the focus has mainly been the other way around in other kinds of promotion practices, with a particular emphasis on scientific proficiency. Furthermore, peers do not have to rank the candidates in promotion processes. In comparison with the hiring of teachers, this particular form of promotion both expands and reduces the peer review practice.

It is evident that the level of excellence is especially difficult to recognize in the promotion of 'distinguished university teachers'. When left to the peer reviewers to identify, teacher excellence has some common traits that are expressed on a rather abstract and general level in the form of expected chains or links. Nevertheless, even in this context, excellence as an empty signifier seems to have some sort of external referent, while lacking internal content (see Laclau & Mouffe, 1985; Readings, 1996); that is, the notion of teaching excellence is identified mainly as a generic phenomenon. This finding is similar to prior research on the recruitment of academic teachers in Sweden (Levander et al., 2019). The very limited focus on the products of teaching is also worth noting; metrics have a less prominent standing and original or innovative teaching is of minor importance. This finding has similarities with prior research on promotion (Hyon, 2011). However, it is a divergence from some institutional evaluations in which metrics and products of teaching hold a strong, sometimes criticized, position (Canning, 2019). Similarly, products, originality, and metrics are prominent in assessments of scientific proficiency.

The conceptualization of teaching excellence, including its assessment, is also dependent on the emergent institutionalization of this specific promotion process, which sets it apart from other peer review practices to some degree. The balance between standardization and professional judgement delimits the leeway given to peers in comparison with other academic evaluation practices. Even though the decision lies with the promotion committee, the prime gatekeeper in the promotion process is, as stated above, the peer reviewer. However, the national and institutional framing of the process causes the gatekeeping function of this particular promotion process to be more explicitly split between several actors. Faculty guidelines are definitely more elaborated when it comes to

criteria and indicators, albeit silent on the level of standard. The assessment of reviewers is more bounded, as criteria and indicators are more clearly specified and fixed in advance by local gatekeepers.

A significant and powerful key mechanism in the making of teaching excellence is the selection of peers—that is, who qualifies as a peer, and why. Obviously, there are great differences in peer selection depending on whether it is teaching, research, or both that are to be assessed. When it comes to the latter, it is typical for Swedish higher education institutions to select scholars who have been recognized within the international scientific community and within the relevant inter/disciplinary domain. However, when teaching excellence is the object of evaluation, the context is constructed differently perhaps because of the national and institutional framing of education and of how education in itself is understood. As shown earlier in this chapter, peers may be disciplinary experts, have special expertise in teaching, and/or be specialized in the evaluation of teaching. Sometimes these competencies coincide, but often they do not. It is reasonable to assume that the differences in competencies have a major impact on the peer review practice and on the construction of teaching excellence within different disciplinary domains. Obviously, the peer review practice in itself, as well as its context, is decisive for the outcome. In what way and to what extent this is true needs to be further explored, preferably by means of a comparative approach.

A Latecomer and an Emergent Game Changer?

The two-staged career track (from academic teacher to ‘distinguished university teacher’) that is now open to all permanently employed teachers is a latecomer in the career and reward structure at our case university. It adds a rank and diverges itself from the other career paths in being open to teachers without a PhD as well. The aim of this particular promotion practice is to recognize and reward teaching excellence in order to change the balance between teaching and research, raise the status of academics engaged in teaching, and enhance the reputation of excellent teachers.

Some scholars argue that the value of rewarding excellent teaching may be jeopardized if the processes for doing so are vague, and call for more and clearer criteria, along with a congruence between criteria and indicators (Chism, 2006). Others assert that endeavours to enhance the value of teaching by means of various kinds of teaching awards are based on tokenism, and tend to counteract this enterprise rather than support it. Hence, there is an impending risk that the reward system will entail a symbolic value without leading to real changes in practice (Macfarlane, 2011). Yet others argue that organizational drift that transforms academic values may occur if ‘pedagogical skills’ are stressed ‘at the expense of subject didactics’ (Kaiserfeld, 2013, p. 174). The consequences of this particular promotion practice remain to be seen, however, and are beyond the scope of the present study.

The evaluation machinery (Dahler-Larsen, Chap. 6 in this volume) and the quality movement in academia have become such a profound part of contemporary higher education institutions that they affect academics’ work in all respects. The evaluation of research as well as teaching has increased in importance and scope, and academics increasingly undertake a number of evaluation tasks each year. The time consumed for research evaluation has been estimated to equal about one month’s worth of work per year for a professor (Langfeldt & Kyvik, 2011). Obviously, this impacts what we, as researchers, may expect from evaluation reports in terms of both scope and content. Furthermore, as an expert evaluation, peer review is based on professional judgement and is not expected to evoke strong formalization. It is plausible that reviewers reach a conclusion about a candidate rather quickly, based on their expertise and overall assessment. To legitimate their conclusion, they subsequently look for signs that support their judgement (Musselin, 2002). Such a logic suggests that it is less reasonable to expect a full account of the rationale of the final judgement in the evaluation reports. Hence, in order to reach a deeper understanding of reviewers’ reasoning, interviews would be a promising avenue for further research. All in all, this chapter illustrates how the admittance of ‘distinguished university teachers’ lies at the intersection of promotion, peer review, and teaching excellence.

References

- Angermüller, J. (2010). Beyond excellence—An essay on the social organization of the social sciences and humanities. *Sociologica*, 2010(3), 1–16.
- Batagelj, V., Ferligoj, A., & Squazzoni, F. (2017). The emergence of a field: A network analysis of research on peer review. *Scientometrics*, 113(1), 503–532. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2522-8>
- Beljean, S., Chong, P., & Lamont, M. (2015). A Post-Bourdiesian sociology of valuation and evaluation for the field of cultural production. In *Routledge International Handbook of the Sociology of Arts and Culture* (pp. 38–48). Routledge.
- Boshier, B. (2009). Why is the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning such a hard sell? *Higher Education Research & Development*, 28(1), 1–15.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Homo Academicus*. Polity.
- Boyer, E. L. (1990). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate*. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Canning, J. (2019). The UK Teaching Excellence Framework (TEF) as an illustration of Baudrillard's hyperreality. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 40(3), 319–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2017.1315054>
- Centra, J. (1993). *Reflective faculty evaluation*. Jossey-Bass.
- Chen, R., & Hyon, S. (2005). Faculty evaluation as a genre system: negotiating intertextuality and interpersonality. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2(2), 153–184. <https://doi.org/10.1558/japl.2005.2.2.153>
- Chism, N. V. N. (2006). Teaching awards: What do they award? *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(4), 589–617. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2006.0031>
- Dahler-Larsen, P. (2015). The evaluation society: Critique, contestability and skepticism. *SpazioFilosofico*, 13, 21–36.
- Devitt, A. (1991). Intertextuality in tax accounting: Generic, referential, and functional. In C. Bazerman & J. Paradis (Eds.), *Textual dynamics of the professions: Historical and contemporary studies of writing in professional communities* (pp. 336–357). The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Elken, M., & Wollscheid, S. (2016). *The relationship between research and education: Typologies and indicators. A literature review*. NIFU.
- Glassick, C., Huber, M., & Maeroff, G. (1997). *Scholarship assessed: Evaluation of the professoriate*. Jossey Bass.
- Hamann, J. (2019). The making of professors: Assessment and recognition in academic recruitment. *Social Studies of Science*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306312719880017>

- Hamilton, J. E. (2019). Cash or kudos: Addressing the effort-reward imbalance for academic employees. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 26(2), 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000107>
- Höhle, E. (2014, September). Chair and department: Adequate models for describing Academic Career Paths? An empirical analysis in eleven European countries. In *27th CHER-Conference in Rome*.
- Hyon, S. (2011). Evaluation in tenure and promotion letters: Constructing faculty as communicators, stars, and workers. *Applied Linguistics*, 32(4), 389–407. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amr003>
- Kaiserfeld, T. (2013). Why new hybrid organizations are formed: Historical perspectives on epistemic and academic drift. *Minerva*, 51, 171–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-013-9226-x>
- Krause, K. (2009). Interpreting changing academic roles and identities in higher education. In M. Tight (Ed.), *The Routledge international handbook of higher education*. Routledge.
- Kreber, C., & Cranton, P. A. (2000). Exploring the scholarship of teaching. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 71(4), 476–495. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2000.11778846>
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony & socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. Verso.
- Lamont, M. (2009). *How professors think. Inside the curious world of academic judgment*. Harvard University Press.
- Lamont, M., & Mallard, G. (2005). *Peer evaluation in the social sciences and the humanities compared: The United States, The United Kingdom, and France*. Report for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.
- Langfeldt, L., & Kyvik, S. (2011). Researchers as evaluators: Tasks, tensions and politics. *Higher Education*, 62(2), 199–212.
- Levander, S. (2017). *Den pedagogiska skickligheten och akademins väktare: Kollegial bedömning vid rekrytering av universitetslärare*. [The educational proficiency and the gatekeepers of Academia]. PhD Diss. Uppsala: Uppsala University.
- Levander, S., Forsberg, E., & Elmgren, M. (2019). The meaning-making of educational proficiency in academic hiring: A blind spot in the black box. *Teaching in Higher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2019.1576605>
- Macfarlane, B. (2011). Prizes, pedagogic research and teaching professors: Lowering the status of teaching and learning through bifurcation. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16(1), 127–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2011.530756>

- Mallard, G., Lamont, M., & Guetzkow, J. (2009). Fairness as appropriateness. Negotiating epistemological differences in peer review. *Science Technology Human Values*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243908329381>
- Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. The Free Press.
- Merton, R. K. (1996). *On social structure and science*. University of Chicago Press.
- Musselin, C. (2002). Diversity around the profile of the 'good' candidate within French and German universities. *Tertiary Education and Management*, 8(3), 243–258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13583883.2002.9967082>
- Musselin, C. (2005). European academic labor markets in transition. *Higher Education*, 49, 135–154.
- Musselin, C. (2010). *The market for academics*. Routledge.
- Musselin, C. (2013). How peer review empowers the academic profession and university managers: Changes in relationships between the state, universities and the professoriate. *Research Policy*, 42, 1165–1173.
- O'Meara, K. (2011). Inside the panopticon: Studying academic reward systems. In J. C. Smart & M. B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 26, pp. 161–220). Springer.
- O'Meara, K. A. (2006). Encouraging multiple forms of scholarship in faculty reward systems: Have academic cultures really changed? *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2006(129), 77–95. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.173>
- Paulsen, M. B. (2002). Evaluating teaching performance. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2002(114), 5–18.
- Ramsden, P., Margetson, D., Martin, E., & Clarke, S. (1995). *Recognising and rewarding good teaching in Australian Universities*. Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Harvard University Press.
- Sabaj Meruane, O., González Vergara, C., & Pina-Stranger, Á. (2016). What we still don't know about peer review. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 47(2), 180–212. <https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.47.2.180>
- Sauder, M. (2006). Third parties and status position: How the characteristics of status systems matter. *Theory and Society*, 35(3), 299–321.
- Serrano Velarde, K. (2018). The way we ask for money... the emergence and institutionalization of grant writing practices in academia. *Minerva*, 56(1), 85–107. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11024-018-9346-4>
- SFS. (1992:1434). *The Swedish Higher Education Act Including the Act on Amendment of the Higher Education Act* (2019:505).
- SFS. (1993:100). *The Swedish Higher Education Ordinance Including the Act on Amendment of the Higher Education Ordinance* (2019:276).

- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Swedish Govt. Bill. (2009/2010:80). *En reformerad konstitution* [A Reformed Constitution]. Stockholm: Ministry of Education.
- Taylor, J. (2008). The teaching-research nexus and the importance of context: A comparative study of England and Sweden. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 38(1), 53–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920701467792>
- Tight, M. (2016). Examining the research/teaching nexus. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 6(4), 293–311. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2016.1224674>
- UFV. (2010/1842). *Guidelines for admittance of excellent teachers*. Adopted December 6, 2011. Revised May 15, 2012. Uppsala University.
- UKÄ, Swedish Higher Education Authority. (2019). *Higher Education Institutions in Sweden. 2019 Status Report*. UKÄ.
- van den Brink, M. (2010). *Behind the scenes of science: Gender practices in the recruitment and selection of professors in the Netherlands*. Pallas Publications.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.