

GUIDELINES FOR PROMOTION TO AND WITHIN THE NEW RESEARCH STAFF CAREER 2016-17

Contents

1. Introduction to the Guidelines
2. Timing of Promotion in the Academic Session
3. Criteria for Promotion
4. Role of the Head of Department in the Promotion Process
5. Candidates' Submitted Writings in Support of Case
6. External Peer Review
7. Procedures of the Promotion Process
8. Decisions of the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are advised to read these Guidelines in their entirety. These Guidelines, and associated Template Forms, are also available on the [Human Resources website](#). Should there be the need to amend these Guidelines, Heads of Department will be informed accordingly.

Queries on NRSC promotions should be directed to the following member of staff in Human Resources in the first instance:

Sofia Avgerinou, Head of HR Services and Operational Policy (Secretary to the Appointments Committee)
Human Resources Division, LRB 5th Floor
Email: HR.Reviewandpromotion@LSE.ac.uk
Tel: 020 7955 6068



INDEX

1.	<u>INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES.....</u>	<u>3</u>
1.1	Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)	4
1.2	Self-Sponsored Promotion Route	4
1.3	Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances	4
1.4	Part-Time Staff	5
1.5	Interviews	5
1.6	Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission	6
1.7	Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process	6
1.8	Research Staff Review Development Scheme and Mentoring	6
1.9	General	7
2.	<u>TIMING OF PROMOTION IN THE ACADEMIC SESSION</u>	<u>8</u>
2.1	Timing of Promotions	8
2.2	Out-of-phase Retention Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow Cases	8
3.	<u>CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION.....</u>	<u>9</u>
3.1	Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow	9
3.2	Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow	10
3.3	Criteria for Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow	12
3.4	Unsuccessful promotion proposals	14
4.	<u>ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS</u>	<u>15</u>
4.1	Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee	15
4.2	Departmental Support for Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate	15
4.3	Content of the Head of Department's Statement	16
4.4	Responsibility for Submission of the Self-Sponsored Case for Promotion to the Promotions Committee	17
4.5	Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement	17
5.	<u>CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE</u>	<u>18</u>
5.1	Work cited on the CV	18
5.2	Work submitted for Promotion	18
6.	<u>EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW</u>	<u>20</u>
6.1	Role of External Referees in the Promotions Process	20
6.2	Criteria for Selection of External Referees	21
6.3	Role of Departmental Assessors and External Experts in the Process for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow	22
6.4	Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts List	24
6.5	Confidentiality	25
7.	<u>PROCEDURES OF THE PROMOTION PROCESS</u>	<u>26</u>
7.1	Consideration of Promotion Cases	26
7.2	Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals	27
7.3	Emergency Promotion Procedures	27
8.	<u>DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE</u>	<u>29</u>
8.1	Notification of Decisions	29
8.2	Salary Determination	29

Annexes

- Annex A: Promotions Committee: Terms of Reference
- Annex B: Membership of the Promotions Committee 2016-17
- Annex C: Timetable for Promotion to or within the NRSC 2016-17
- Annex D: Reference Guide to Deadlines for Review And Promotion Documentation
- Annex E: Reference Guide to Peer Reviewers (External & Internal)
- Annex F: Form Template Samples

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES

These guidelines provide information about the processes and criteria governing promotion to the New Research Staff Career (NRSC) and promotion within the NRSC.

From the 2016-2017 session, there will no longer be a promotion route within the old research staff career structure beyond promotion to Research Officer (band 6) and research fellow (band 7). For research staff from band 6 upwards on the old career structure, promotion to the NRSC is to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow (from Research Officer or Research Fellow), to Associate Professorial Research Fellow (from Senior Research Fellow or Principal Research Fellow) or to Professorial Research Fellow (from Principal Research Fellow). Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow is normally from Research Fellow. However, in exceptional circumstances, a Research Officer can be promoted to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow at the discretion of the Promotions Committee. In very exceptional circumstances, a Research Fellow can be promoted directly to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and a Senior Research Fellow can be promoted directly to Professorial Research Fellow.

Promotion within the NRSC is to Associate Professorial Research Fellow from Assistant Professorial Research Fellow or to Professorial Research Fellow from Associate Professorial Research Fellow. In very exceptional circumstances, an Assistant Professorial Research Fellow can be promoted directly to Professorial Research Fellow.

The Promotions Committee (a sub-committee of the Appointments Committee) is the formal School decision-making body which reaches decisions about the success of all promotion proposals.

Conditional on funding confirmation and entitlement to work in the UK, decisions about success for promotion proposals are made solely on merit, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, and the contribution he/she is making to the work of the Department and the School. Promotion considerations will take account of the School's Policy Statement on Equality and Diversity and will recognise the existence of non-standard and interrupted careers.

Promotions applications (whether from a Department or the self-sponsored route) should be made only if they can be funded from the Department, Centre or Institute's resources. The Research Infrastructure and Investment Funding (RIIF funding), which is made available by the School under the Research Incentives Policy, may also be used for these purposes. Heads of Departments will need to provide funding confirmation when putting forward staff for promotion or will be asked to confirm the availability of funding in the case of self-sponsored applications.

The Promotions Committee's terms of reference and membership for the current session, are set out at **Annex A** and **Annex B** to these Guidelines as well as being available on the Human Resources website.

Please note that where the Guidance refers to "normally" or "in an exceptional case", it is at the discretion of the Vice Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC), in the first instance, whether the rules can be waived. Heads of Department must consult with the VCAC as early as possible if they think they are dealing with an exception to any part of the Guidance.

If any member of staff has a concern with the promotion process, whether at School or Department level, he or she is entitled to raise it formally with the VCAC who will take appropriate further steps to investigate and act upon that concern.

1.1 Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)

Professor Charles Stafford is the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC) from 1 September 2017. The VCAC may be contacted at c.stafford@lse.ac.uk for advice on specific cases throughout the session. The VCAC works closely with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), Professor Eric Neumayer.

1.2 Self-Sponsored Promotion Route

Candidates may propose their own promotion, if their Departments do not intend to recommend them. All members of Research Staff are notified of the annual Promotion timetable and corresponding deadlines for submission of promotion proposals by Human Resources.

Research staff contemplating a self-sponsored promotion route are reminded that all promotions of research staff are contingent on the availability of funding and entitlement to work in the UK.

Candidates electing to proceed under the self-sponsored route are encouraged to seek a meeting with the VCAC to discuss their case.

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 7 Procedures**. Template forms are at **Annex F** and, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the [Human Resources website](#)

1.3 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances

The School expects that if staff members' individual circumstances are affecting their day-to-day activities or performance the individual would have raised these at the earliest opportunity with their Department or, where applicable, Research Centre or Institute and the Department, Centre or Institute will have addressed these issues, with the advice of Human Resources, as soon as reasonably possible. Furthermore, the School expects that most circumstances do not need to be stated on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/6* as these can be resolved through local discussion. For advice please consult the relevant HR Partner in the first instance.

If the circumstances are exceptional then the Promotions Committee will, where necessary, consider the effect of a candidate's individual circumstances on their career progression where information has been provided by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director.

The following are examples of individual circumstances that might apply where these have had a significant impact on progress and performance:

- Disability (including conditions such as cancer and chronic fatigue)
- Ill health or injury
- Mental health conditions
- Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption, paternity or childcare **in addition to** periods of parental leave taken. This could include, for example, pregnancy related illness.
- Other caring responsibilities (including caring for an elderly or disabled relative)
- Gender reassignment

Please note that periods of interruptions in service due to maternity leave, adoption leave, substantial paternity leave, secondment or special leave buyout should be declared on the *Curriculum Vitae Template G/2*.

The *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/6* should be completed and signed by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director. The information provided on this form, with advice from the Department's HR Partner, will inform the VCAC's advice to the Promotions Committee as to the severity of the circumstances. The details of the circumstances will not be disclosed to the Promotions Committee or the Department or Research Centre / Institute unless the candidate so wishes and has therefore asked the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director to sign the form. For self-sponsored promotion candidates, the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/6* should be completed and signed by the candidate.

Please note that if there are personal circumstances that are affecting the day-to-day activities or performance of the candidate which are not declared on the form by the deadline on the form, the Promotions Committee may not be able to take account of them in its decision on the case.

For all promotion cases, the Internal Reader and Monitor are requested to alert Human Resources before the Christmas vacation if their provisional grading is likely to be a C or D. At this point, in cases where the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form NRSC/6* has been submitted, the VCAC and Human Resources may begin gathering further information on the background of the case.

Human Resources may then request a more detailed statement from the Head of Department (including in self-sponsored cases) to aid advice to the VCAC. This information will not be shared with the Promotions Committee and may include information such as the following:

- A description of the situation
- The effect it has had on the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Details of any Doctors notes, OH referral recommendations etc. (where applicable)
- Action taken by Department, including any reasonable adjustments made to the candidate's role in the Department, flexible working arrangements, mentoring, Departmental commitments including administration
- The effectiveness of those adjustments in increasing the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Career advice given in Career Development Review (ACDR) Meetings and agreed actions.

The Promotions Committee will give careful consideration to the VCAC's indication of the severity and impact of the circumstances and may make recommendations to the Department and/or the candidate regarding the candidate's future career progression at the School.

Please refer to the Promotion Timetable (**Annex C**) for all deadlines.

1.4 Part-Time Staff

The Promotions Committee expects that part-time staff will have an academic profile of equivalent quality to that of full-time staff. However, the Committee accepts that the quantity across the range of academic activities will be commensurate with the part-time appointment. The VCAC may be contacted for advice on specific cases.

1.5 Interviews

Consideration of promotion proposals by the Promotions Committee is a documented process based on evaluation of written reports and materials.

There is no entitlement to interview for either the candidate or the Head of Department, although in exceptional circumstances the Promotions Committee may invite a Head of Department or, for self-sponsored promotion cases, the candidate to attend – if, for example,

there is a need for factual clarification in a particular case. Wherever possible, Heads of Department (and in the case of self-sponsorship, the self-sponsored candidate) should be in the School and available on the dates the Promotions Committee meets (in the Lent term) to consider promotions (dates of this session's meetings are available at **Annex C** of these Guidelines and on the [Human Resources website](#)).

1.6 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission

The current session deadlines for submission of documentation to Human Resources are set out in the Promotion Timetable (**Annex C** of these Guidelines). Heads of Department are responsible for forwarding all documentation to Human Resources by no later than the specified dates.

Departmental responsibility for deciding whether to put an individual forward for promotion lies with the Head of Department and Professors within a Department. For research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, Heads of Department should collaborate with the Research Centre / Institute Director and should consult with the Department's Professoriate (the lead Department's Professoriate where the Research Centre / Institute is associated with more than one Department). The Head of Department should also have consulted with any other relevant colleague (e.g. Principal Investigator or research group leader).

In cases of self-sponsored promotion, the individual may submit the promotion documentation directly to Human Resources or via their Head of Department as desired.

Failure to submit materials by the due date may preclude consideration of the case.

1.7 Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process

The Promotions Committee complies with the Data Protection Act 1998 as amended, in processing personal data in relation to consideration of individual promotion cases.

All persons asked to provide statements, references and reports about candidates for promotion are advised that their documentation is confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Promotion processes. However, in circumstances such as a grievance, legal proceedings or a valid subject access request under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998 reports may have to be disclosed to a third party. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will not accept comments, either written or verbal from third parties (those from whom comments had not been formally solicited).

1.8 Research Staff Review Development Scheme and Mentoring

The School expects that all research staff and particularly those in the early stages of a research career at the School should receive constructive advice on career development from senior colleagues.

The School has in place two approaches to structuring career development conversations for research staff:

- A Mentoring Scheme for junior research staff
- A Research Staff Career Development Scheme which is designed for all Research Staff throughout their LSE career.

Both aim to give Research Staff guidance on how to make most effective use of their career within LSE both for their own development and to ensure their contribution to the School as a whole. The Mentoring Scheme is distinct from the Research Staff Career Development Scheme. Mentors give informal and frequent advice and provide a listening ear throughout the year, whereas formal career development meetings take place annually (for Research

Officers, Research Fellows, Senior Research Fellows, Assistant Professorial Research Fellows and Associate Professorial Research Fellows) or bi-annually (for bands 9 and 10 Principal Research Fellows, and Professorial Research Fellows) and are normally conducted by the Head of Department/Research Centre / Institute Director or his/her nominee. The Researcher Career Development Review Meeting is intended to allow for an open and constructive exchange of views, which as well as taking into account future plans enables a review of past performance, achievements and experience.

Importantly, the mentor cannot be the one holding the Career Development Meeting. Research Officers, Research Fellows and Assistant Professorial Research Fellows level (regardless of the length of contract) should be assigned a mentor by their Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director, in discussion with the Principal Investigator for the project. Other research staff may request a mentor via the Principal Investigator or the Head of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director.

The VCAC, in conjunction with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) and Human Resources, is responsible for oversight and implementation of the Researcher Career Development Review Scheme and for reporting on any issues to the Promotions Committee.

Further guidance on the Researcher Career Development Scheme can be found on the LSE Human Resources website [here](#). Further guidance on the Mentoring Scheme for research staff can be found [here](#).

All research staff may access the training and development opportunities available within the School and in most cases this is at no cost to the individual or the project. PIs/Managers should actively encourage research staff to attend relevant courses/workshops available at the School.

1.9 General

These Guidelines are subject to periodic review and may be amended or updated as the School considers necessary.

2. TIMING OF PROMOTION IN THE ACADEMIC SESSION

2.1 Timing of Promotions

Promotions are considered annually in the Lent term of each session at an all-day meeting of the Promotions Committee. Heads of Department, Research Centre / Institute Directors and Principal Investigators should ensure that research staff who are expected to go forward for promotion are given sufficient time to prepare their application in the period leading up to the deadlines specified in Annex C and Annex D.

There is normally a period of two years after an unsuccessful promotion attempt before another proposal will be considered by the Promotions Committee. However, the Promotions Committee may agree that a case may come before it again in the next promotion round without waiting for two years to elapse. There is no limit on the number of occasions on which a candidate may be put forward for promotion. When considering a promotion proposal, the Promotions Committee will not have before it information about any previous unsuccessful promotion proposal(s) from that candidate.

2.2 Out-of-phase Retention Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow Cases

The Promotions Committee is aware of the pressures created when urgent retention issues arise and seeks to work with Heads of Department to deal with such matters expeditiously, without threatening the integrity and quality of the School's established procedures.

The emergency Major Review and promotion procedures are dealt with in detail in **Section 7.3 Emergency Procedures**.

3. CRITERIA FOR PROMOTION

3.1 Criteria for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow

The criteria for promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow are as follows:

Research productivity and excellence

A candidate should demonstrate intellectual originality and valuable contributions to research-based knowledge, with evidence of an emerging research programme and trajectory that is likely to result in the development of a body of outstanding quality publications in well recognised peer reviewed outlets. This will normally be evidenced by:

- Research outputs that are, at least, internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour. Candidates should present two research outputs. The Promotions Committee welcomes if these research outputs have been published as peer reviewed journal articles and/or books but is willing to accept unpublished writings.
- Contribution to recent success in obtaining external research funds, especially in peer-reviewed processes
- Supportive external assessments by competent external peer reviewers
- A detailed and convincing written research statement showing the intellectual agenda guiding the candidate's work, its likely importance to her or his field and/or the public, and its future potential, and how it fits with the research agenda of the Department or Centre / Institute in which they are employed

Whilst not a requirement, it may also be additionally evidenced by:

- Indicators of influence in the candidate's scholarly field, for example reviews and citations of work

Knowledge, Engagement and Impact

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Actively developing strategies to ensure that research outputs have demonstrable impact and inform the public debate
- Engaging with non-academic audiences

Management and leadership of research projects

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Ability to lead small research projects that may involve co-ordinating the work of others
- Training and supervising the work of research assistants and/or of research officers
- Contributing to the development of teams, through supervision and peer support

Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have sought to develop their own skills and/or those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- Evidence from external peer review

Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

3.2 Criteria for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow

The criteria for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow are as follows:

Research productivity and excellence

A candidate should demonstrate intellectual originality, a high level of productivity in work of significant interest, and valuable contributions to research-based knowledge. A candidate should have a research programme and trajectory that is likely to result in a body of publications of outstanding quality in top quality and well recognised international peer reviewed outlets. This will normally be evidenced by:

- Publication of research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books that is, at least, internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour. Candidates should normally present four research publications, though this is not a binding requirement and overall quality is more important than quantity
- Indicators of influence in the candidate's scholarly field, for example reviews and citations

- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions
- Recent success in obtaining external research funds, especially in peer-reviewed processes
- Supportive external assessments by competent experts
- A detailed and convincing written research statement showing the intellectual agenda guiding the candidate's work, its likely importance to her or his field and/or the public, and its future potential, and how it fits with the research agenda of the Department, Centre or Institute in which they are employed

Knowledge, Engagement and Impact

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Advising or participating in government/international committees, private sector organisations, international bodies, the non-profit sector, or in other governmental or non-governmental organisations, in order to bring research-based knowledge to broader publics
- Actively developing strategies to ensure that research outputs have demonstrable impact and inform the public debate
- Engaging with non-academic audiences.

Management and leadership of research projects

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Applying for, negotiating and managing large research projects, grants and/or research centres
- Co-ordinating a number of teams or projects on a longer-term basis, ensuring that the team are collectively producing outputs that are of outstanding quality and published in top quality and well recognised international peer-reviewed outlets and/or producing significant research impacts
- Determining the overall direction of major research projects
- Playing a leading role in the development of the host unit's strategic research policy and driving the intellectual agenda
- Leading the monitoring and enhancement of quality in research within the centre/institute/department
- Managing teams of researchers
- Training and supervising the work of more junior researchers
- Contributing to the development of teams, through supervision and peer support

Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have

sought to develop their own skills and those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- Evidence from external peer review

Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

3.3 Criteria for Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow

Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow status comes in recognition of major accomplishments in research and publications combined with excellence in research leadership and growing participation in administration and governance.

Candidates should be internationally recognised leaders in their fields. Their research should be influential and known not only in their specialty area but more widely in their discipline or interdisciplinary area.

In addition to research leadership, weight will also be given, as appropriate to different fields, to success in entrepreneurial activities, public engagement, informing public policy, and providing service to fields of professional practice.

All candidates for promotion to Professorial Research Fellow should demonstrate significant contributions to departmental and School-wide strategic management and governance, and should show potential to contribute to the mentoring and career development of junior members of staff.

The relevant criteria for promotion are:

Research productivity and excellence

- A substantial body of published research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books. Candidates should present four research publications selected from their

publication portfolio, all of which must be published or have been accepted for publication. (For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form.) All submitted items must be at least internationally excellent and two of the submitted items must be world leading in terms of originality, rigour and significance. Consistent with the School's emphasis on quality of publications as a pre-eminent criterion, candidates may exceptionally submit fewer than four publications. In such cases, a statement of justification from the Head of Department is required. Submitted publications should, other than in exceptional circumstances, not have been used as outputs submitted for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow (or at the equivalent time in their previous appointment for candidates appointed to the School as Associate Professorial Research Fellows). Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department.

- An international reputation as evidenced by reviews of publications, citations, prizes and honours, and assessments by peers.
- Planning and directing research activities and programmes of outstanding quality and international significance
- Leading major peer reviewed funding bids and achieving substantial success in attracting such funding
- A strong record of securing significant amounts of peer-reviewed research funds and where appropriate, contributions to School Research Centres, Departments or Institutes
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions and a demonstration of how that agenda fits with that of the Research Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based.

Knowledge Engagement and Impact

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Evidencing research leadership and expertise through advising or participating in government/international committees, private sector organisations, international bodies, the non-profit sector, or in other governmental or non-governmental organisations
- Leading scholarly initiative in relevant disciplinary or inter-disciplinary communities – e.g. editorial of journals, membership of committees in professional associations, appointment to significant research bodies
- Ensuring that research impact and engagement with wider audiences is at the heart of research strategy within the centre/institute/department.
- Engaging with non-academic audiences.

Research Leadership and management

Candidates should normally be able to evidence the following or be able to show that they are suitably qualified and competent to carry out the following (subject to the opportunities available, the contractual obligations imposed by the external funding agency and with the agreement of the grant-holder, Principal Investigator, Centre/Institute Director and/or Head of Department, in accordance with established line management arrangements and commensurate with their current post):

- Co-ordinating a number of teams or projects on a longer-term basis, ensuring that the team are collectively producing outputs that are of outstanding quality and published in top quality and well recognised international peer-reviewed outlets and/or producing significant research impacts
- Determining the overall direction of major research projects

- Leading and managing teams of researchers
- Financial management of research projects and maintaining productive, ongoing relationships with funders
- Training and supervising the work of research staff
- Providing leadership to the development of teams

Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration

The Promotions Committee will also take account of contributions to the management, administration or other activities of the Centre, Department or Institute where the candidate is based or service in School governance roles, and the extent to which candidates have sought to develop their own skills and those of others through receiving or delivering training, mentoring and other similar activities.

The Promotions Committee bases its decision on its view of the evidence presented in the following documentation on template forms available from Human Resources:

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and/or the School. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review process
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources.
- Evidence from external peer review

Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department or Research Centre / Institute Director are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

The Committee may also seek such other evidence as it deems appropriate.

3.4 Unsuccessful promotion proposals

The process following the Promotions Committee's decision is discussed in **Section 8 Decisions of the Promotions Committee**.

4. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE PROMOTION PROCESS

4.1 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are responsible for the electronic submission of all documentation for Promotion proposals to the Promotions Committee via Human Resources. For research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, the Head of Department should collaborate with the Research Centre / Institute Director in preparing the documentation. It follows that Heads of Department, in collaboration with Research Centre / Institute Directors (where applicable), are expected to take an active role in advising candidates on presentation of their CVs on the *CV Template NRSC/2*, ensuring that information is set out clearly and that there are no omissions. Heads of Department and, where applicable, Research Centre / Institute Directors are also expected to sign off on these forms.

Documentation submitted directly to Human Resources by candidates will not be accepted (unless for self-sponsored promotion cases).

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 7 Procedures**. Template forms are at **Annex F** and can also be found on the Human Resources website.

Documentation for the Promotion process (including writings) should be **electronically submitted** to Human Resources. Should this be impossible please contact Human Resources in good time to arrange an alternative.

4.2 Departmental Support for Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate

The Head of Department must have consulted professorial colleagues regarding the candidate, and the Head of Department's Statement should be based on the information submitted to and considered by the department's Professoriate. For research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, HoDs should collaborate with the Research Centre / Institute Director and should consult with the Department's Professoriate (the lead Department's Professoriate in case the Research Centre / Institute is associated with more than one Department). The Head of Department should also have consulted with any other relevant colleague (e.g. Principal Investigator or research group leader).

The *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* should make clear which members of the Professoriate (e.g. Professors on leave) were involved in the discussion leading to the decision to recommend promotion. The Committee expects that a decision will be taken on the basis of a vote by all serving Professors, and that the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* will indicate the numbers voting for and against as well as those abstaining. A candidate cannot normally be put forward for promotion unless he/she has majority support of those voting. The Promotions Committee does not regard unanimity of the departmental Professoriate as a *sine qua non* of a successful case, but does expect that if there are differing opinions these will be explained in full in the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1*.

Departments may solicit external references to inform their decision on whether to support a candidate for promotion. Where Departments do so, the following rules apply:

- The list of referees needs to be approved by the VCAC who will apply the same criteria as listed in Section 6.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees.
- Candidates should be invited to nominate up to 50 per cent of the referees.
- The soliciting letter/email needs to be approved by the VCAC. To maximise the usefulness of references, referees should be sent the writings that would be submitted to the School's Promotions Committee and ask referees to comment in detail on the quality of these writings.

- All soliciting emails should be copied to Human Resources and all references received must be made available to the VCAC and Human Resources.
- Where the case does not receive Departmental support, the VCAC will check that the candidate has been treated fairly.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, all reference letters solicited by the Department will be made available to the Promotions Committee.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, the VCAC has the right to allow the reference letters solicited by the Department to substitute for some or all of the reference letters that would otherwise be solicited by the Promotions Committee.

4.3 Content of the Head of Department's Statement

For research staff located in Departments, this statement should be drafted by the Head of Department; for research staff located in Research Centres or Institutes, this statement should be drafted by the Head of Department in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director.

The Head of Department's statement should provide a full evaluative commentary on the candidate's academic profile, across the range of research, service and administration and other professional activities, as evidenced by the curriculum vitae, ensuring detail is provided to inform the Promotions Committee's decision. The Promotions Committee expects Heads of Department to address the following areas in their reports on candidates:

1. Research Productivity and Excellence

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should indicate his/her opinion of the quality of the candidate's research, published outputs, and future trajectory - including, where appropriate, the candidate's success in publishing in the top journals or with the top presses in the field. Heads of Department should indicate any issues where journal lead-times may be a factor affecting the quantity of published output. **The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), is expected to comment in detail on the quality of each of the publications submitted to the Promotions Committee.**

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should outline the Departmental view on the assessment of research quality including, where appropriate:

- Prestige publishing outlets which may include the titles of the top journals and top presses in the field
- The relative weighting, if any, given to articles over books or vice-versa
- Whether co-authorship is the norm within the field, and comment on any joint-authored work submitted
- Clarifying the significance of conference contributions in the candidate's field
- A definition of what is regarded as international standing in the candidate's discipline.

The Promotions Committee recognises that variations exist and it will not be seeking to compare approaches across disciplines.

The Promotions Committee may use the Departmental Journal Lists, which are submitted to the Promotions Committee at its first meeting of the session, to inform its decision-making and evaluation of candidates.

Citation Evidence:

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation

records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

2. Knowledge Engagement and Impact

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide his/her opinion of the candidate's contribution to knowledge engagement and impact with reference to the relevant criteria listed in **Section 3 Criteria for Promotion**.

3. Management and leadership of research projects

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide his/her opinion of the candidate's contribution to management and leadership of research projects with reference to the relevant criteria listed in **Section 3 Criteria for Promotion**.

4. Activities relating to centre/institute/departmental/School management and administration

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should provide his/her opinion of the candidate's contribution to the work of the School, whether at Departmental, Centre or Institute level or in the wider School context.

5. Career Development

The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), should confirm that Career Development Review Meetings (CDR Meetings) have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and the Department's expectations for future career progression.

4.4 Responsibility for Submission of the Self-Sponsored Case for Promotion to the Promotions Committee

Candidates wishing to propose themselves for promotion on a self-sponsored basis are free to submit the self-sponsored proposal through their Head of Department or directly to Human Resources.

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, the Criteria can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 7 Procedures**. Template forms are at **Annex F** and, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the Human Resources website.

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate to be submitted by the HoD Deadline 2 as listed in **Annex D**. The Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research / Institute Director (where applicable), will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the Departmental Professoriate. If the self-sponsored proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit his/her statement on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

4.5 Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement

The Promotions Committee expects self-sponsored candidates to frame their reports with the criteria for promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or promotion to Professorial Research Fellow in mind.

5. CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE

5.1 Work cited on the CV

Candidates should note that the Promotions Committee reserves the right to request sight of any work cited on the *CV Template NRSC/2*. It follows that all work should be available, preferably in electronic form, in case the Promotions Committee should request it.

The dated electronic signatures of the candidate and Head of Department and, where applicable, the Research Centre / Institute Director on the electronic version of the *CV Template NRSC/2* are required as confirmation that the information provided is accurate.

5.2 Work submitted for Promotion

The Promotions Committee will consider the quality of writings of Promotion candidates. The candidate should submit to Human Resources the required number of writings which he/she believes best represent his/her qualities.

For items where no electronic copy is available, candidates are encouraged to scan them to make them electronically available. Where this is not feasible, **seven** properly-ordered sets of each writing that are not available electronically, should be submitted to Human Resources, either in the form of original hard copies or photocopies of the original hard copy. Any reviews, whether favourable or not, which have appeared on any the candidate's books, whether submitted as part of the writings or not, should also be submitted. All writings submitted as hard copy will be returned to the candidate by the beginning of the academic session following that in which they were submitted.

Careful consideration should be given to the selection of writings in support of the case. Candidates are asked to explain on their CV the rationale for selecting the writings submitted in support of promotion and how the selected items relate to one another.

Stage of Publication

For promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow, the expectation is that, normally, writings submitted will be published or have been accepted for publication (accompanied by a confirmation letter or email from the editors/book publishers). For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form.

All candidates are asked to state clearly on the CV the stage all their publications has reached – e.g. whether work submitted for publication has finally been accepted, conditionally accepted, is in revise and resubmit status or is submitted. Evidence of acceptance (whether final or conditional) will be required in all cases – i.e. for all work on the CV not just the submitted pieces. For all publications on the CV in revise and resubmit status, candidates are required to submit evidence of the editors' confirmation email inviting the candidate to revise and resubmit the piece.

Co-authorship

Where possible, candidates should give priority to writings where they have made the leading or major contribution as candidates should recognise that the Committee is looking for evidence of a leading or major contribution across all publications submitted.

The Promotions Committee recognises that co-authorship is the norm for some disciplines and where this is the case, jointly authored work will be considered of equal standing. Candidates are required to provide a numerical indication in percentage terms of their contribution(s) to joint work on the CV, alongside the requirement to state the respective contributions of co-authors in regard to the initiation, conduct and direction of the work. Candidates should also provide details of the degree of intellectual contribution made to the

work (e.g. indicating their involvement in the formulation of key themes, concepts and theories). The statement should not exceed 200 words. **The Promotions Committee reserves the right to ask co-authors for a confirmation of the respective contributions stated by promotion candidates.**

Multiple book chapters of the same book

The Promotions Committee expects to be able to assess a range of candidates' work. Wherever possible, the submission of multiple chapters of the same book as separate works should be avoided.

Publication language

The expectation is that normally publications submitted in support of promotion will be written in English.

In cases where a publication(s) submitted is not written in English, the Department is responsible for translating the work into English. Where this cannot reasonably be expected, the Department should contact the VCAC at their earliest opportunity to request an exemption from this rule. If an exemption is granted, the Department is responsible for providing a summary in English, summarising the output and outlining the research methodologies used. The Department should also suggest the name(s) of external experts able to read the work in the original language.

Presentation of Writings

Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that:

- Wherever available, writings should be submitted in electronic form rather than in hard copy.
- Writings are properly-ordered and clearly identified for the ease of readers.
- Wherever possible, submitted hard copies should be photocopies of originals.
- Large manuscripts should be drilled and treasury-tagged and not submitted loose-leaf.

6. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

The Promotions Committee solicits external peer review advice as part of its decision-making process. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will not accept comments, either written or verbal from third parties; third parties being those from whom comments had not been formally solicited

It is the responsibility of the Head of Department, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director (where applicable), to ensure that, prior to nomination, all external reviewers (Referees, External Experts and Departmental Assessor) are willing to be contacted by the VCAC and to participate in the process.

All external reviewers are thanked for their advice and are informed about successful cases for whom they served.

A reference guide to the Promotion Committee's requirements regarding external peer review can be found at **Annex E**.

6.1 Role of External Referees in the Promotions Process

Referees are asked to comment specifically and in detail on each of the candidate's submitted publications as well as their planned research as set out in the research trajectory statement. They can also comment on the general research profile of candidates. The Promotions Committee gives its referees the option to provide comparisons to research staff from the same cohort in the candidate's field. Referees are not sent the *Head of Department Statement NRSC/1*.

For promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow candidates, Heads of Department are required to provide the names of **four** external referees for each candidate on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/4*. For promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and promotion to Professorial Research Fellow candidates, Heads of Department are required to provide the names of **six** external referees (including two reserves) for each candidate on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/4*. The Promotions Committee will seek references from at least four of the six nominated external referees. Some of these referees can be suggested by candidates (see Annex E for details). In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which referees to consult and is not bound to accept referee nominations proposed by Departments. Instead or in addition it can nominate its own set of referees. The Promotions Committee gives its referees the option to provide comparisons to research staff from the same cohort in the candidate's field.

Referees for Self-Sponsored Promotion

Self-sponsored candidates are required to provide the names of **six** external referees (including two reserves) on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/4*.

To ensure the necessary degree of independence in the nomination of external referees for self-sponsored cases, the VCAC will take a view on the suitability of the referees proposed by the self-sponsored candidate and may consult the candidate's Head of Department. Self-sponsored candidates will be expected to provide written justification in any case where the VCAC is of the view that the criteria of selection of external referees (see **Section 7.2**) are not met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

The VCAC will be free to invite the Departmental Assessor to take a view on the suitability of external referees proposed in self-sponsored cases. Where this occurs, the view of the Departmental Assessor will be sought prior to Human Resources contacting the external referees.

In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which referees to consult and is not bound to accept names proposed by the self-sponsored candidate. The

Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the candidate.

Referees for Emergency Promotion

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of **four** departmentally-sponsored external referees (including two reserves) on the *Referees for Promotion Form NRSC/4*, to be consulted by the Committee. The Promotions Committee or, where this is not feasible, the VCAC takes the final decision about which referees to consult and is not bound to accept referee nominations proposed by Departments. Instead or in addition it can nominate its own set of referees.

Grading Criteria

Referees are asked to apply the grading criteria agreed by the Promotions Committee using the grading scale A-D where,

- A - Excellent case
- B - Good case
- C - Borderline case – merits full discussion in Committee.
- D - Case looks inadequate – merits full discussion in Committee.

6.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees

Heads of Department will be expected to provide written justification in any case where it is felt the below requirements cannot be met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

- All referees should be employed by a distinguished university.
- Wherever appropriate referees should be of international standing and active in research publication in the appropriate field.
- The naming of referees should not, normally, include people who have co-authored with the candidate in the past four years. Heads of Department should seek the advice of the VCAC for disciplines where joint authorship is the norm and where co-authors may be best placed to act as referees.
- The naming as referees of eminent scholars who are unfamiliar with a candidate's work or who may not be able to provide anything other than very general comments should be avoided.
- There may be different aspects of a candidate's work to be assessed and referees should be nominated with this in mind and with an indication where appropriate of which aspect(s) a referee is being asked to comment on.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate referees with an appropriate profile which could include referees from outside the Department's discipline.

Additional requirements for referees for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow:

- At least one referee should be employed by a top tier UK University and at least one should be employed by a distinguished overseas institution.
- Referees should be confined to those of full Professorial status or equivalent. Heads of Department should provide written justification in any case where a referee does not hold the title of Professor.
- The nomination of more than one referee from the same Department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- Referees should not normally have been on the staff of the School in the four previous years, held a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment at the School in the four previous years or hold a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment currently.

- The naming of referees should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

6.3 Role of Departmental Assessors and External Experts in the Process for Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow

The Departmental Assessor and External Experts are not involved in the process for promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow.

For the process for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or Professorial Research Fellow, the respective roles of the Departmental Assessor and External Experts are outlined below:

Departmental Assessor:

A Departmental Assessor is a person of high seniority and eminence within the particular discipline with an overview of the subject sufficient to enable him/her to assess all candidates for promotion from the department irrespective of specialism. The Departmental Assessor receives the promotion papers, including the *Head of Department Statement NRSC/1*, for all promotion candidates, whether put forward by the department or self-sponsored. It is not a requirement that the Departmental Assessor reviews candidates' writings although writings are available to Assessors on request.

In nominating the Departmental Assessor, Heads of Department should note:

- That the Departmental Assessor may not also be nominated as a Referee or External Expert for promotion proposals.
- The Departmental Assessor should not, normally, have collaborated with the candidate in the past four years on joint work.
- The Departmental Assessor should not have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

Where the Departmental Assessor is potentially unsuitable for a particular promotion case, Heads of Department should contact the VCAC in the first place. The VCAC may recommend nominating an External Expert who can function as Departmental Assessor on a particular promotion proposal or set of promotion proposals.

External Experts:

The Promotions Committee allocates **two** External Experts to each promotion proposal. Names are drawn from the Departmental External Experts List and are allocated on the basis of specialism within the discipline. Heads of Department are required to submit nominations on the *External Experts for Promotion Form NRSC/5*. External Experts are asked to assess the case for promotion on the basis of the candidate's promotion papers (see **sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3**) and will also be asked to review the writings submitted by the candidate in support of promotion.

The role of the External Expert is distinct from that of a Referee. Whereas a Referee may be expected to concentrate on the candidate's major achievements, External Experts are asked to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's work as a whole, comment specifically on the candidate's planned research as set out in the research trajectory statement, indicate his/her national and international standing in the specialist field of the discipline and comment on whether or not it would be regarded by other distinguished specialists in the field as anomalous if the candidate was promoted to the level proposed. Contrary to Referees, External Experts are sent the *Head of Department Statement NRSC/1*.

The Promotions Committee invites Heads of Department to review Departmental External Experts Lists on an annual basis, prior to the commencement of the next promotion round. Departmental External Expert Lists are approved at Promotions Committee's first meeting of each session. **The Promotions Committee expects that Departments ensure that no**

less than 30 per cent of their External Experts are female. If Departments believe they cannot fulfil this requirement, they must provide the Promotions Committee with a written justification why they cannot fulfil this requirement.

Duration of Appointment

Departmental Assessors: The Promotions Committee has agreed that, on the ground of continuity, the maximum period of appointment for Departmental Assessors shall normally be ten years - i.e. two terms of five years each.

External Experts: are appointed without term, on the basis that they may be asked to act in the capacity of External Expert by the Promotions Committee should a proposal fall within their area of expertise.

Grading Criteria

Departmental Assessors/External Experts are asked to apply the grading criteria agreed by the Promotions Committee using the grading scale A-D where,

- A - Excellent case
- B - Good case
- C - Borderline case - merits full discussion in Committee
- D - Case looks inadequate - merits full discussion in Committee.

Nomination of Departmental Assessor and External Experts for Departmentally-sponsored Promotion cases

Heads of Department are asked to provide Departmental Assessor and External Expert nominations on the *External Experts for Promotion Form NRSC/5*. Where a Department has more than one Departmental Assessor, one of them should be named. **Four** names of External Experts are required in total (including two reserves). These will normally be drawn from departmental lists of External Experts submitted to Human Resources prior to the start of the session.

In the selection of External Experts for individual promotion cases, Heads of Department should note in particular:

- That an External Expert may not also be nominated as a Referee for the same promotion proposal.
- The nomination of more than one External Expert from the same department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- There may be different aspects of a candidate's work to be assessed and External Experts should be nominated with this in mind and with an indication where appropriate of which aspect(s) an External Expert is being asked to comment on.
- The naming of External Experts should not, normally, include people who have collaborated with the candidate in the past four years on joint work.
- The naming of External Experts should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.
- The naming as External Expert of eminent scholars who are unfamiliar with a candidate's work or who may not be able to provide anything other than very general comments should be avoided.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate External Experts with an appropriate profile which could include Experts from outside the Department's existing list of External Experts.

In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which External Experts to consult and is not bound to accept names proposed by the Department. The Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the Department.

Nomination of Departmental Assessor and External Experts for Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals

Self-sponsored promotion candidates are asked to provide External Expert nominations on the *External Experts for Promotion Form NRSC/5*. **Four** names are required in total (including two reserves). These will normally be drawn from departmental lists of External Experts submitted to Human Resources prior to the start of the session.

Self-sponsored promotion candidates may seek a copy of the Departmental External Experts List from their Head of Department or from Human Resources. In cases where a self-sponsored candidate considers that the Departmental External Experts List does not adequately cover their own area of expertise, candidates are advised to speak to their Head of Department in the first instance to discuss the addition of further names to the Departmental External Experts List. The advice of the VCAC may also be sought on individual cases.

The following should be noted in particular:

- That an External Expert may not also be nominated as a Referee for the same promotion proposal.
- The nomination of more than one External Expert from the same department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- There may be different aspects of a candidate's work to be assessed and External Experts should be nominated with this in mind and with an indication where appropriate of which aspect(s) an External Expert is being asked to comment on.
- The naming of External Experts should not, normally, include people who have co-authored with the candidate in the past four years on joint work.
- The naming of External Experts should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.
- The naming as External Expert of eminent scholars who are unfamiliar with a candidate's work or who may not be able to provide anything other than very general comments should be avoided.
- Self-sponsored promotion candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests should nominate External Experts with an appropriate profile which could include Experts from outside the Department's existing list of External Experts.

The VCAC will consult the candidate's Head of Department on the suitability of External Experts proposed for self-sponsored cases. In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which External Experts to consult and is not bound to accept names proposed by the self-sponsored candidate. The Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the candidate.

6.4 Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts List

- All Departmental Assessors and External Experts should be employed by a distinguished university.
- Departmental Assessors and External Experts should be confined to those of full Professorial status or equivalent. Heads of Department/Institute should provide written justification in any case where a Departmental Assessor or External Expert does not hold the title of Professor.
- Departmental Assessors and External Experts should not normally have been on the staff of the School in the four previous years, held a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment at the School in the four previous years or hold a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment currently.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate External Experts with an appropriate profile which could include Experts from outside the Department's existing list of External Experts.

- For any External Expert nominations, the Department/Institute should submit the following on the appropriate template spreadsheet available from Human Resources:
 - External Expert's name and full, authenticated and up-to-date contact details (email and postal address).
- For **new Departmental Assessor and new External Experts nominations** from non-Russell Group universities in the UK and any overseas universities, the Department should also submit the following:
 - A brief statement on the scholarly quality of the person
 - A brief statement on the institution's international standard compared to that of the School.

In nominating the Departmental Assessor, Heads of Department should also note:

- That the Departmental Assessor may not also be nominated as a Referee or External Expert for promotion proposals
- The Departmental Assessor should not, normally, have co-authored with the candidate in the past four years.
- The Departmental Assessor should not have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

Where the Departmental Assessor is potentially unsuitable for a particular promotion case, Heads of Department should contact the VCAC in the first place. The VCAC may recommend nominating an External Expert who can function as Departmental Assessor on a particular promotion proposal or set of promotion proposals.

6.5 Confidentiality

Referees, External Experts and Departmental Assessors are advised that any reference provided in connection with the Promotion processes will be confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Promotion processes. The references are not normally disclosed to Promotion candidates or to Heads of Departments. However, in circumstances such as a grievance, legal proceedings or a valid subject access request under the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998, references may have to be disclosed to a third party.

7. PROCEDURES OF THE PROMOTION PROCESS

7.1 Consideration of Promotion Cases

Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees and, where applicable, the Departmental Assessor and External Experts, and of the internal opinions as expressed in the *Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1* and the opinion of the Internal Reader assigned to assess the candidate's publications as well as the Internal Monitor. The Promotions Committee is in no way bound to follow the recommendation of the Head of Department. It is a basic School principle that Departmental recommendations for Promotion are subject to assessment and evaluation by Professors from other departments. It is open to the Promotions Committee either to endorse the recommendation or to reject it.

Role of Promotions Committee Readers

All submitted writings will be read by a member of the Promotions Committee from a related department or discipline (or a member of the Appointments Committee). All readers are required to submit a short written review of the writings to the Promotions Committee. Their views serve as a basis for discussion by the Promotions Committee. The identity of the reviewer(s) and the contents of their written reports are not revealed to the candidates. The VCAC or the Promotions Committee may decide that member(s) of the Promotions Committee (or a member of the Appointments Committee) in addition to the nominated Committee member should read the writings.

Grading Criteria

Internal Readers read candidates' submitted writings and apply the grading criteria agreed by the Promotions Committee as part of their summative evaluation of cases using the grading scale A-D where,

- A - Excellent case
- B - Good case
- C - Borderline case – merits full discussion in Committee.
- D - Case looks inadequate – merits full discussion in Committee.

Role of Promotions Committee Monitors

All promotion cases will have one principal Internal Reader with a second member of the Committee appointed to each case in the role of 'Monitor'.

The purpose of the monitoring role is to ensure equity of treatment in the consideration of cases. The Monitor is provided with a full copy of the candidate's papers as listed in **Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3**. The Monitor does not read the candidate's submitted pieces as a matter of routine, although copies of writings are provided on request.

The Monitor will provide a brief comment on the case. The comments of the Monitor are in addition to close reading of the cases by the appointed Internal Reader. Should the Internal Reader award a grade of C or D to the candidate, then the Internal Monitor automatically becomes the Second Internal Reader, in which case he/she will also read the candidates' submitted writings.

Deferral of cases to a later meeting

Where, in the view of the Internal Reader / Monitor / Committee, a case is deemed to be borderline (categories 'C' and 'D' under the Promotions Committee grading scale) or there is insufficient evidence to make a decision, a decision on the case may be deferred to the next meeting of the Promotions Committee to allow for further opinion(s) to be sought / further information to be gathered. Where this occurs, the candidate and Head of Department will be informed of the adjustment in the timescale.

7.2 Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals

Individuals wishing to propose themselves for promotion on a self-sponsored basis are free to submit the self-sponsored proposal through their Head of Department or directly to Human Resources.

Promotion proposals are considered solely on merit by the Promotions Committee according to the criteria for promotion to the level sought.

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate. The Head of Department (where applicable, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director) will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the Departmental Professoriate. If the self-sponsored promotion proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit his/her statement (where applicable, in collaboration with the Research Centre / Institute Director) on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

Before reaching a decision, in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Departmental Assessor, External Experts and Referees, of the internal opinions as expressed in the promotion proposal, and the opinions of the two Internal Readers assigned to assess the candidate's publications (for self-sponsored cases there is no Internal Monitor; instead both members of the Promotions Committee assigned to the case function as Internal Readers).

7.3 Emergency Promotion Procedures

The Emergency Promotion Procedures only apply for promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow or promotion to Professorial Research Fellow cases. Like all promotions for research staff, emergency promotion is also subject to funding confirmation.

The Promotions Committee has agreed the following criteria for emergency procedures:

- Evidence, in the form of a written offer from a comparator peer academic institution is required. Offers from the commercial sector are not deemed relevant in this context.
- The Promotions Committee would, unless in exceptional circumstances, expect confirmation from the Head of Department that the candidate would in any event, be put forward in the forthcoming promotion round.

The Appointments Committee has agreed the following two procedures to deal with emergency requests for Promotion which arise out of phase. The emergency procedures cannot be used for late applications for promotion.

Procedure (1) [Emergency which arise in session]

Procedure (1) is designed to deal with emergency requests for Promotion which arise during the session outside the normal annual cycle (and including normally, the Michaelmas and Easter vacations). Procedure (1) is identical (except in timing) to the procedures used for the main Promotions exercise but the procedure is accelerated as far as possible so that a decision may be reached at an early opportunity – normally at the next scheduled meeting of the Promotions Committee.

The Pro-Director (Faculty Development) will determine on advice from the VCAC, whether the individual circumstances justify the use of Procedure (1). Heads of Department are advised therefore, to contact the VCAC in the first instance.

Procedure (2) [Emergency Proposals which arise out of session]

Procedure (2) is designed to achieve as far as possible a procedure which remains comparable to the main Promotions exercise.

As with Procedure (1), the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) will determine on advice from the VCAC whether Procedure (2) should be triggered. Heads of Department should, therefore, contact the VCAC in the first instance.

Having achieved consent for the case to proceed under Procedure 2, the Head of Department should submit the documentation for Promotion to Human Resources. Heads of Department are advised that the emergency procedures cannot be initiated until complete documentation is received by Human Resources consisting of the following elements:

- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research and contributions to the Department and the School
- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research

The Promotions Committee will seek opinions from **two** external Referees, **one** External Expert and the Department Assessor nominated by the Department on the relevant template forms.

Heads of Department should refer to the relevant sections of these Guidelines for further information on the headings to be addressed in the Head of Department's Statement (**Section 4.3**), criteria for selection of Referees (**Section 6.2**), roles of the Department Assessor and External Experts (**Section 6.3**), and writings (**Section 5**).

A Panel comprising members of the Promotions Committee will have authority to consider emergency requests which arise out of session. The Panel's membership will normally comprise the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), the VCAC, and the Pro Director, Teaching and Learning.

Panel members will consider a full set of papers relating to the candidate, comprising:

- Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1
- Candidate's CV (including research trajectory & research achievement record, statement on past & ongoing research grants and management & leadership of research) NRSC/2
- Reports of two external Referees nominated by the Department
- Reports of the Departmental Assessor and External Experts nominated by the Department
- Report of the Internal Reader and Monitor (normally Promotions Committee members)

The Panel, having considered all the relevant information as described above, will reach an initial decision. The Panel will make a recommendation to the full Promotions Committee which will be asked, by circulation, to endorse it. In the event that any two members of the Promotions Committee raise an objection, the decision will be held over until the first scheduled meeting of the Promotions Committee in the following academic year (for the dates of the upcoming session please contact Human Resources).

For emergency proposals dealt with under Procedure (2), the aim will be to reach a decision within four weeks of the date the Department delivers the **completed documentation** to Human Resources. Heads of Department should note that this timetable may be affected by factors outside the Promotions Committee's control such as the availability and goodwill of external academic colleagues to act on short notice.

In exceptional circumstances, the Pro-Director (Faculty Development),, on advice from the VCAC, may agree to amend Procedure (2) to facilitate a decision on a particular case sooner than the one month period.

8. DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

8.1 Notification of Decisions

Decisions of the Promotions Committee remain confidential until candidates have been notified in writing of the outcome. Letters, copied to the Head of Department, will normally be issued within 10 working days following the conclusion of the meeting. Letters will normally be signed by the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) or, alternatively, by the VCAC.

Successful Promotion

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a candidate fulfils the requirements for promotion, the staff member concerned will be promoted to the relevant higher career grade, normally from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for the higher career grade.

Unsuccessful Promotion Applications

Unsuccessful candidates will be sent a personal letter setting out the reasons for the Promotions Committee's decision. Unsuccessful candidates are encouraged to seek a meeting with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) in his/her capacity as Chair of the Promotions Committee or with the VCAC, to discuss their case. At this meeting, staff will be offered guidance on what they need to do in order to strengthen their case for promotion in the future. There is no right of appeal against decisions reached by the Promotions Committee. The candidate's Head of Department will also be informed of the reasons for the Committee's decision.

Waiting Period and Re-Applications

The convention is that, normally, there should be a two-year gap between submissions of promotion proposals following an unsuccessful promotion attempt. In exceptional cases, the Promotions Committee may agree that a case may come before it again in the next promotion round without waiting for two years to elapse.

There is no limit on the number of occasions on which a candidate may be put forward for promotion. The Promotions Committee will not have before it information about any previous unsuccessful promotion proposals for this candidate..

Reporting to the Appointments Committee

The names of all successful Promotion candidates are reported to the Appointments Committee.

8.2 Salary Determination

Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow

Staff promoted to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow will normally move to the minimum salary for Assistant Professorial Research Fellows, Step 39.5, to be paid from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, they will be rewarded with one additional increment.

Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow

Staff promoted to Associate Professorial Research Fellow will normally move to the minimum salary for Associate Professorial Research Fellows, Step 45.5, to be paid from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, they will be rewarded with one additional increment.

Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow

Staff promoted to Professorial Research Fellow will normally move to the minimum salary for Professorial Research Fellows, Step 55.5, to be paid from the following 1 August or from the date for which funding for the promotion is available within the academic session, if earlier. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, any increase will not be less than the value of three steps on the relevant professorial salary scales.

Further information on the LSE salary scales is available on the [Human Resources website](#).

PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: Terms of Reference and Membership

1. Purpose of Committee

The Promotions Committee is the formal School decision-making body which considers and reaches decisions on departmental recommendations for Interim Review and Major Review. The Committee is also the decision-making body for proposals to promote members of the academic staff to Associate Professor and Professor and members of the research staff to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow. The Promotions Committee is a Sub-Committee of the Appointments Committee and is chaired by the Pro-Director (Faculty Development).

2. Membership

The membership of the Promotions Committee is approved annually by the Appointments Committee and comprises *ex officio*:

Pro-Director (Faculty Development) (Chair)
Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee
Pro-Director Teaching and Learning

And fifteen professorial members nominated from the five [Academic Board constituency Groups](#). There are three professorial representatives from each Academic Board Group.

Professors currently serving as Heads of Department are ineligible to be considered for Committee membership until their term as Head of Department expires.

From the 2016/17 academic session onwards, no less than one third of the fifteen professorial members nominated from the five Academic Board constituency Groups should be women and no less than one third should be men.

The VCAC will be required to explain in the VCAC annual report to the Appointments Committee why this target could not be met if it was not met in a specific year.

The Committee is supported by Human Resources.

3. Nomination Procedure

Nominations to fill vacancies arising on the Promotions Committee will be sought from Heads of Department. It will normally be expected that nominations will carry the support of all Heads from within the Group(s) in which vacancies occur. The VCAC works together with Heads of Department to seek gender and disciplinary balance as well as representation of smaller Departments in their nomination of candidates.

In the interests of ensuring that the Committee retains an appropriate balance in terms of gender, subject coverage across disciplines and representation of smaller departments, the VCAC has discretion to nominate up to five professorial representatives to serve on the Committee. The VCAC's nominees may be drawn from any of the five Academic Board Groups.

4. Term of Office

One half of the elected members of the Promotions Committee will normally retire from the Committee at the end of each academic session and no appointed member who has served a full term of office (which is normally two years) will be re-eligible until three further years have elapsed.

Casual vacancies are filled by the appointment of a new member drawn from the Academic Board Group in which the vacancy occurs, who will serve for the unexpired period of the appointment.

5. Code of Conduct

Committee members are expected to take a School-wide view of the issues before them and not to represent departmental views. As a matter of principle, Committee members take no part in the deliberations or reaching of decisions for promotion proposals from within their own departments. Committee members are expected to make themselves available to attend every meeting in view of the importance of maintaining continuity in the deliberations of the Committee. Committee members are expected to respect the importance of dealing with the work of the Committee in the strictest confidence at all times. Members should not reveal the Committee's deliberations in any part outside of meetings.

6. Schedule of meetings

The dates of the Committee's annual schedule of meetings are published in the School Calendar. The Committee meets twice in the Michaelmas term, twice in the Lent term, and once in the Summer term. In addition, there may, on occasion, be exceptional circumstances which necessitate convening a special meeting in vacation periods - e.g. to consider an emergency promotion proposal.

Terms of Reference

1. Title of Committee: Promotions Committee

2. Status of Committee: Sub-Committee of the Appointments Committee

3. Responsibilities delegated to the Promotions Committee by Appointments Committee:

3.1 To monitor quality and to act as the decision-making body for individual proposals put forward under the annual promotion and review round for academic staff concerning Interim Reviews, Major Reviews (including award of Major Review Teaching Prizes) and Promotions as well as proposals put forward under the annual promotion round for research staff promotions to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow, and to report annually to the Appointments Committee.

3.2. To consider any issues referred to the Committee by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee concerning the individual progress of pre-Major Review staff; where appropriate, to consider and implement measures to monitor and provide support towards meeting School expectations for a successful outcome at Interim/Major Review.

3.3. To have oversight of policy and procedures pertaining to the School's arrangements for promotion and review of academic staff (including promotion and review criteria) and research staff; to review and report annually to the Appointments Committee on the operation of these arrangements and to make recommendations as appropriate on developments or changes to policy and procedures.

3.4. To have oversight of equality and diversity issues in relation to the annual promotion and review round; to receive reports on the profile of promotion and review candidates by gender and ethnicity

with a view to looking at potential inequalities and ensuring that School procedures do not discriminate. To make recommendations to the Appointments Committee as appropriate on equality and diversity issues in respect of promotion and review procedures.

3.5. To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on policy issues relating to the recruitment and retention of academic staff.

3.6 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on any issues referred by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee arising from the operation of the *Career Development Review Scheme*.

3.7 To consider and make recommendations on any other policy matters or issues which have a direct bearing on its work that may be referred to it by the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee, the Appointments Committee, and other School committees/fora, or arising from the outcomes of the Staff Survey or the work of the Staff Consultative Council.

4. Arrangements for Promotions Committee to report to Appointments Committee on the exercise of its delegated authority:

4.1 The Promotions Committee shall report to Appointments Committee on its determinations and any significant policy or procedural issues – including recommendations on changes to policy and procedures - annually, in the Summer term.

4.2 The Committee shall report to other School committees/fora as appropriate regarding any relevant issues.

5. Frequency of Meetings

5.1 The Committee normally meets twice in the Michaelmas term, twice in the Lent term, and once in the Summer term. The annual schedule of Committee meetings is published in the School meetings calendar.

5.2 The Committee can convene exceptionally out of cycle – e.g. in relation to emergency proposals for promotion.

5.3 Decisions can be taken by the Committee by correspondence and email.

6. Chair

6.1 The Pro-Director (Faculty Development) chairs meetings of the Committee under delegated authority from the Director. In case he/she recuses himself/herself, the Pro-Director Teaching and Learning takes over as Chair. In case, he/she recuses himself/herself as well, the VCAC takes over as Chair.

7. Voting

7.1 All official members of the Promotions Committee are entitled to vote on a case. Members do not vote on cases from their own Department. The Chair does not normally vote but has the casting vote. The VCAC does not vote unless he/she chairs *in lieu* of the Chair in which case he/she has the casting vote.

Last updated 8 June 2016

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: 2016-17

Ex Officio	Pro-Director Faculty Development (Chair) Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee Pro Director – Teaching and Learning	Professor Eric Neumayer Professor Charles Stafford Professor Paul Kelly
GROUP 1	Accounting Finance Management	Professor Bjorn Jorgensen ² Professor Amitav Chakravati ² Professor Kathy Yuan ²
GROUP 2	Government International Relations International Development European Institute	Professor Mark Thatcher ² Professor Catherine Boone ² Professor William Callahan ¹
GROUP 3	Economics Mathematics Philosophy Statistics Language Centre	Professor John Sutton ² Professor Jason Alexander ² Professor Irini Moustaki ¹
GROUP 4	Anthropology Social Policy Social Psychology Sociology Gender Institute Media and Communications Methodology	Professor Lucinda Platt ² Professor Chetan Bhatt ² Professor Laura Bear ¹
GROUP 5	Economic History Geography and Environment International History Law	Professor Giles Atkinson ² Professor David Kershaw ² Professor Tirthankar Roy ²

¹ Serving first year of a two-year term, 2016-18.² Serving second year of a two-year term, 2015-17.

PROMOTION OF RESEARCH STAFF TO OR WITHIN THE NRSC: TIMETABLE FOR 2016-17

Documentation, including writings in electronic form, should be submitted electronically to HR.Reviewandpromotion@LSE.ac.uk. Hard copy writings for Review and Promotion proposals should be submitted to the Reward, Review & Promotions Team, Human Resources, 5th Floor Lionel Robbins Building.. **Failure to submit documents by the stated deadline may preclude consideration of the case.**

Michaelmas Term:	Thursday 22 September – Friday 9 December
Mon 10 October 2016	Heads of Department's Deadline 1 (see Annex D for details)
Mon 31 October 2016	Heads of Department's Deadline 2 (see Annex D for details)
Wed 9 November 2016	Promotions Committee (Schedule of Business) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers Departmental External Experts Lists for use in the current Review and Promotions round. Receives names of Review and Promotion candidates and approves Referees to be consulted forthwith. Approves allocation of Departmental Assessors and External Experts to advise on Review and Promotion cases. Considers proposals for advancement / deferral of Interim Review / Major Review. Appoints Internal Readers and Monitors to read the writings of candidates for all cases except those for Interim Review.
Wed 23 November 2016	Promotions Committee (Interim Reviews) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes decisions on Interim Reviews of Lecturers and Assistant Professors
Lent Term:	Monday 9 January – Friday 24 March
Wed 8 February 2017	Promotions Committee (Lecturers' Major Review and New Research Staff Career promotions) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes decisions on Major Review of Lecturers. Takes decisions on promotions of research staff. <p>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT are asked to ensure they are present in the School and available to attend this meeting, if called.</p>
Wed 8 March 2017 & Thu 9 March 2017	Promotions Committee (Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Academic Promotion cases) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider proposals for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor, proposals for Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only) and proposals for Promotion to Professor <p>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT are asked to ensure they are present in the School and available to attend this meeting, if called.</p>
Summer Term:	Monday 24 April – Friday 9 June
Wed 10 May 2017	Promotions Committee (Annual Review) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conduct an annual review of policy and procedures in light of the current session's Promotion and Review round, with proposals for changes to policy / procedure recommended to the annual meeting of the Appointments Committee.
Wed 07 Jun 2017	Appointments Committee (VCAC's Annual Report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for changes to policy / procedure in respect of the annual academic promotion and review round, recommended by the Promotions Committee. A report on the general pattern of quality and procedures for academic appointments across and within the School.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO DEADLINES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION

Departments must submit the documentation outlined below to **Human Resources** at
HR.Reviewandpromotion@LSE.ac.uk

Case type	HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 10 October 2016)	HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 31 October 2016)
Department Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A final Departmental External Expert List • A final Departmental Journal List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing required
Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including research trajectory & research achievement record & statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2 • Funding confirmation • Referees for Promotions NRSC/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1 • Electronic copies of 2 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Promotion to Associate Professorial Research Fellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including research trajectory & research achievement record & statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2 • Funding confirmation • Referees for Promotions NRSC/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1 • External Experts for Promotion NRSC/5 • Electronic copies of, normally, 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Promotion to Professorial Research Fellow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including research trajectory & research achievement record & statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2 • Funding confirmation • Referees for Promotions NRSC/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1 • External Experts for Promotion NRSC/5 • Electronic copies of, normally, 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Self-sponsored Promotion (for candidates submitting their own documents, the HoD deadline applies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including research trajectory & research achievement record & statement on past and ongoing research grants and management and leadership of research NRSC/2 • Funding confirmation • Referees for Promotions NRSC/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate's Statement NRSC/7 • External Experts for Promotion NRSC/5 • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews* • Head of Department's Statement NRSC/1
Emergency Promotion	<p><i>Until Human Resources receives the following, they cannot act:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department Statement NRSC/1 • CV, including research trajectory & research achievement record & statement on past & ongoing research grants and management & leadership of research NRSC/2 • Referees for Promotion NRSC/4 • External Experts for Promotion NRSC/5 • Funding confirmation • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances NRSC/6 <p><i>These documents must follow as soon as possible:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic copies of writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews* 	

* If e-copies are unavailable then 7 hard copies of each item are required.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO PEER REVIEWERS (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)

The **Departmental External Experts Lists** and all Referee nominations on **Referees form G/4** to be submitted for the VCAC's review and Committee's approval by HoD Deadline 1 (**Monday 10 October 2016**). All nominations of External Experts for candidates to be submitted on **External Experts for Promotion form G/5**, by HoD Deadline 2 (**Monday 31 October 2016**). All documentation to be sent electronically to HR.Reviewandpromotion@LSE.ac.uk.

The **Selection Criteria for Referees (Section 6.2)** and **External Experts (Section 6.3)** must be followed when making recommendations, any queries must be directed as soon as possible to the VCAC in the first instance.

	Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow	Promotion to Associate Professorial / Professorial Research Fellow	Self-sponsored promotion	Emergency Promotion	Fee
External Referee	Dept	Dept	Cand	Dept	-
External Referee	Dept	Dept	Cand	Dept	-
External Referee	Cand	Cand	Cand	-	-
External Referee	Cand	Cand	Cand	-	-
External Referee (Reserve)	-	Dept	Cand	Dept	-
External Referee (Reserve)	-	Cand	Cand	-	-
External Expert	-	Dept	Cand	Dept	£200 /candidate
External Expert	-	Dept	Cand	-	£200 /candidate
External Expert (Reserve)	-	Dept	Cand	Dept	-
External Expert (Reserve)	-	Dept	Cand	-	-
Departmental Assessor	-	Dept	Dept	Dept	£250/year + £100/ candidate
Internal Reader	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	-
Monitor/ 2 nd Internal Reader	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	-

FORM TEMPLATE SAMPLES

The following are examples for reference only. The template forms should be submitted with the appropriate electronic signatures to HR.Reviewandpromotion@LSE.ac.uk by the relevant deadline listed in Annex D.

They are available for download on the LSE website here:
www.lse.ac.uk/intranet/staff/humanResources/reviewingAndRewarding/promotionAndReview/PromRev_Home.aspx

- | | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 1. | Head of Department's Statement | NRSC/1 |
| 2. | CV Template | NRSC/2 |
| 3. | CV Template Instructions for Candidates | NRSC/3 |
| 4. | Referees for Promotion Form | NRSC/4 |
| 5. | External Experts for Promotion Form | NRSC/5 |
| 6. | Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form | NRSC/6 |
| 7. | Self-Sponsored Promotion Candidate Statement Form | NRSC/7 |