GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS
2025-2026

Contents

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 academic promotions and reviews should be directed to the following member of staff in Human Resources in the first instance:

Nikhil Kalghatgi, HR Manager, Review and Promotion
(Secretary to the Appointments Committee)
Human Resources Division
Email: hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

CONTENTS

Annexes

Annex A: Promotions Committee Terms of Reference and Membership
Annex B: Membership of the Promotions Committee 2025-2026
Annex C: Timetable for Promotion and Review of Academic Staff 2025-2026
Annex D: Reference Guide to Deadlines for Review and Promotion Documentation
Annex E: Reference Guide to Peer Reviewers (External & Internal)
Annex F: Recipients of Documentation within the Academic Review and Promotion Process

1. INTRODUCTION

These guidelines provide information about the processes and criteria governing review and promotion of Assistant and Associate Professors.

The Promotions Committee (a sub-committee of the Appointments Committee of which the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) (VPFD) is the Chair) is the formal School body that reaches decisions about the success of all review and promotion proposals.

Decisions about success at Interim Review, Major Review or about success for promotion proposals are made solely on merit, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, teaching, and the contribution they are making to the work of the Department and the School. Review and 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.

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 and are available on the Human Resources website.

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 this Guidance.
The Promotions Committee recognises that successful academic careers can take a variety of forms and that the individual trajectories of candidates need to be evaluated holistically.

If any member of staff has concerns about the review and promotion process, whether at School or Department level, they are entitled to raise this formally or informally with the VCAC who will take appropriate further steps to investigate and act upon those concerns.

1.1 Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)

Professor Pauline Barrieu is the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC) The VCAC may be contacted at p.m.barrieu@lse.ac.uk for advice on specific cases throughout the session. The VCAC works closely with the VPFD, Professor Alex Voorhoeve.

1.2 Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Review and Promotion

The Promotions Committee is aware that the Covid-19 pandemic continues to have an impact on the work of colleagues in the School. Where relevant information about this is provided, it will be taken into account in the evaluation of review and promotion cases. This can be provided on the *Head of Department's Statement G/1*; on the *CV template G/2* (in a dedicated section that has been added for the declaration of Covid-19 impacts), as well as on the addenda to the CV – that is, the additional statements on research achievements, research trajectory, contributions to education and contributions to citizenship; on the *Request for Deferral G/5*; on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6* (in particular, where the impacts to be declared are confidential in nature); and on the *Candidate's Statement (For Candidates Considered for Promotion without Departmental Support)G/7* in cases where a candidate is considered without Departmental support, e.g., in cases of self-sponsorship.

1.3 Introduction to Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

The LSE believes strongly in developing the potential of all staff who are recruited to the

School. It is also recognised that individuals will be appointed who are at different stages of their academic careers and considers that a process of structured review is beneficial to both Assistant Professors and the School.

A review process operates for Assistant Professors new to the School which is divided into two stages: Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor. The purpose of these two review processes is to provide the opportunity for detailed and careful consideration of progress against the agreed criteria.

An Assistant Professor without a proven track record regarding either teaching or research can expect to be appointed subject to both Interim Review and Major Review. Interim Review may be waived and an Assistant Professor may be appointed subject to Major Review only where there is an established record of teaching and research.

Departments will be notified at appropriate times by Human Resources on an individual basis of when their Assistant Professors are scheduled to undergo Interim Review or Major Review.

For further details of the aim of Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor, please see **Sections 3.1 and 3.4**, respectively.

1.4 Introduction to Promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review or Assistant Professors

Post-Major Review Lecturers who opted into the New Academic Career have become post-Major Review Assistant Professors. They can be put forward for promotion to Associate Professor by their Department or can self-sponsor a promotion case; the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor will apply.

1.5 Departmental Sponsorship for Promotion

Responsibility for deciding whether to put Assistant Professors forward for promotion to Associate Professor or (full) Professor lies with the Head of Department and Professors within a Department (see **Section 4**) unless a candidate self-sponsors a promotion case (see **Sections 1.6 and 9.3**).

Heads of Department should ensure that the decision *not* to support a candidate is conveyed to the member of staff sufficiently in advance of the published deadlines for submission of self-sponsored promotion proposals to Human Resources to allow time should the member of staff elect to proceed under this route.

1.6 Introduction to the Self-Sponsored Promotion Route

Associate Professors may propose their own promotion to (full) Professor, and post-Major Review Assistant Professors may propose their own Promotion to Associate Professor, if their Departments do not intend to recommend them. Under Promotions Committee procedures, there is **no self-sponsored route** for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor.

All members of academic staff are notified of the annual Promotion and Review timetable and corresponding deadlines for submission of promotion proposals by Human Resources.

Members of academic staff 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 can be found at **Annex D**, and the procedure is dealt with under **Section 9.3**.

1.7 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 and the Department 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 G/6* as these can be addressed 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, by the Head of Department. The following are examples of individual circumstances that might apply where these have had a significant impact on progress and performance:

- Disability as defined by the Equality Act 2010, for example conditions such as cancer, chronic fatigue syndrome and mental health conditions.
- Other instances of ill health or injury not covered above.
- 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 or the ill health of a child.
- Other caring responsibilities (for example caring for an elderly, ill, or disabled relative)
- Other significant life event, for example gender reassignment or bereavement of a family member.

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

For pre-Interim Review and pre-Major Review candidates with periods of parental leave or long-term sickness please also see **Section 2.7 – Automatic Interruption and Stopping of the Review 'Clock'**.

The *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/6* should be completed and signed by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department. 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 nature of the circumstances, the support being provided and whether any other adjustments are necessary (e.g., reasonable adjustments in case of a disability). The details of the circumstances will not be disclosed to the Promotions Committee.

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 may not be able to be taken into account by the Promotions Committee.

In cases where the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/6* has been submitted, the VCAC and Human Resources may gather further information on the background of the case. Human Resources may, if the candidate has informed the Head of Department of the individual circumstances, 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 this 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, Occupational Health referrals, specialist reports and recommendations (where applicable).
- Action taken by the Department, including any reasonable adjustments made to the candidate's role in the Department, flexible working arrangements or 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 Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) 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 **Annexes C and D** for the deadline of submission of the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/6.*

1.8 Disability and the Promotion Process

The School's commitment to providing and developing a positive, supportive and enabling environment for all staff extends to the promotion process in particular and the career development of staff in general. As part of this commitment, a disability which is having a significant impact on an individual's progress and/or performance may be raised and considered under **1.7 – Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances**.

In addition, Heads of Department (and other individuals with management and/or oversight responsibilities) have a role to play in ensuring that New Academic Career staff with disabilities are supported throughout the promotion process, including the agreement and implementation of reasonable adjustments. Similar expectations apply to the Career Development Review process. The relevant HR Partner can provide guidance about what could be considered 'reasonable' in a given situation.

As outlined in 1.7, the impact of a disability on an individual's progress will be relayed to the Promotions Committee by the VCAC along with any recommended adjustments to process. A decision on the case will take the information into account when considering the requirements for promotion as outlined in **Section 2**. The information provided by the VCAC will be based on discussions with the Head of Department and/or the HR Partner and will consider the need for reasonable adjustments to be made based on the individual circumstances.

To ensure that departmental promotions processes also take account of any reasonable adjustments which might be made for an individual, Heads of Department should contact the VCAC to ask for advice where an individual with a disability is being considered for promotion within their department.

Prior to a case reaching the Promotions Committee, it is expected that both individuals and departments will have received support and advice in helping a New Academic Career member of staff with a disability to progress in their career. Further information can be found in the Career Development Review Guidance.

1.9 Part-Time Staff

Interim and Major Reviews for part-time staff will normally take place according to the same schedule as Review for full-time staff.

The Promotions Committee expects that part-time staff will have an academic profile of

equivalent quality to that of full-time staff undergoing Interim Review, Major Review or promotion. 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.

1.10 Interviews

Consideration of Interim Review, Major Review, and 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 Winter Term) to consider Major Reviews and promotions (dates of this session's meetings are available at **Annex C** of these Guidelines and on the Human Resources website).

1.11 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission

The current session deadlines for submission of documentation to Human Resources are set out in the Promotion and Review Timetable and Reference Guide to Deadlines for Review and Promotion Documentation (**Annex C and D** of these Guidelines, respectively). Heads of Department are responsible for forwarding all documentation to Human Resources by the specified dates.

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) in accordance with the deadlines for submission.

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

1.12 GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process

The Promotions Committee complies with the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 as amended, in processing personal data in relation to consideration of individual promotion and review cases.

All persons asked to provide statements, references and reports about candidates for promotion and review are advised that their documentation is confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Review and Promotion processes. However, in circumstances such as a Major Review appeal hearing, grievance or legal proceedings, 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).

1.13 Academic Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring

The Promotions Committee expects that all non-Professorial academics, and particularly those coming up for Interim Review or Major Review, will receive constructive advice on career development from senior academic colleagues. To this end, the School has an established *Academic Staff Career Development Review* (CDR) *Scheme* and full Guidance is available on the Human Resources website. The Scheme is designed to serve the needs of individual academics, enable Heads of Department to manage staff promotions and reviews to flag at an early stage any issues of concern to the Promotions Committee.

Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that the CDR process is operating effectively at departmental level, which includes ensuring that CDR Meetings for Assistant and Associate Professors take place on an annual basis. They are also responsible for ensuring the CDR forms are submitted to Human Resources for the VCAC's review.

The VCAC, in conjunction with the VPFD and Human Resources, is responsible for oversight and implementation of the CDR Scheme and for reporting on any issues to the Promotions Committee.

Mentoring
Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that Assistant Professors are assigned a department Mentor. The Mentoring Scheme is **distinct** from the CDR. Mentors give informal advice and provide a listening ear throughout the year, whereas CDR Meetings address progression and are normally conducted by the Head of Department or a senior professor acting as the Head's delegate. Importantly, the Mentor cannot hold the CDR Meeting. Assistant Professors who encounter difficulties in the mentoring relationship are advised to discuss the situation with their Head of Department in the first instance to explore whether a change of Mentor is necessary. The Mentoring Guidelines are available on the Human Resources website.

New Assistant Professors are also offered a programme of induction activities run by the Eden Centre. Further information is available on the Eden Centre website.

Mentors and Heads of Department are encouraged to contact the Eden Centre for customised, individual advice / training.

1.14 General

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

2. TIMING OF REVIEW AND PROMOTION

2.1 Timing of Interim Review

Departmental nominations for Interim Review can be made in any year, subject to the maximum time limits set out below, allowing for a Department to form a judgement on the quality of a candidate's work, broader contributions to the School and progress toward Major Review. If candidates are nominated before the maximum time limit, Heads of Department should make the case in their *Head of Department Statement G/1* that the candidate is ready to undergo Interim Review and are encouraged to seek guidance from the VCAC.

Interim Reviews are expected to take place in the fourth year of appointment for Assistant Professors. There is scope for the Interim Review to be held earlier or later than this if circumstances warrant the advancement or deferral with a maximum deferral to the fifth year of the appointment. Information about the procedures to follow for deferral of Interim Review is provided in **Section 2.7** below.

For academic staff appointed from 1 January or later in the Academic session, the first year of appointment shall be counted from the following Autumn Term for the purposes of their scheduled Interim Review date.

Certain events also result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the review clock) – see. **Section 2.8** below.

2.2 Timing of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

Departmental nominations for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor can be made in whichever year, subject to the maximum time limits set out below, as may be required for a Department to form a judgement on the quality of a candidate's work and broader contributions to the School. If candidates are nominated before the maximum time limit, Heads of Department should make the case in their *Head of Department Statement G/1* that the candidate is ready to undergo Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor. Heads of Department are encouraged to seek guidance from the VCAC.

For Assistant Professors appointed subject to Interim Review, Major Review will normally take place within **eight years** of the appointment date, though exceptionally an extension of a maximum of one year can be requested where pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming (further information about the procedures to follow for deferral is provided in **Section 2.7**). For academic staff appointed from 1 January or later in the Academic session, the first year of appointment shall be counted from the following Winter Term for the purposes of their scheduled Major Review date.

For Assistant Professors appointed post-Interim Review, the School expects the Major Review normally to take place within **four years** of appointment for Assistant Professors. Though exceptionally an extension of a maximum of one year can be requested where pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming (see also **Section 2.7** below).

Certain events result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the review clock) – see **Section 2.8** below.

2.3 Additional Year to Review Schedules for Assistant Professors due to Covid-19 Pandemic

At the end of the 2019-20 academic session, the Appointments Committee took the decision to add one year to Major Review schedule of all then-employed Assistant Professors in recognition of the impact at the time of the Covid-19 pandemic on many colleagues' work, and on their research work in particularwork.

If they so wish, Assistant Professors can formally opt out of this additional year facility, although

they can be considered for Major Review earlier than their adjusted maximum time limits without having formally opted out. Where an Assistant Professor who has not opted out of the additional year is considered for Major Review before their adjusted maximum time limit and the case is unsuccessful, the Committee will neither pass nor fail the candidate but rule that the application is premature and should be resubmitted in a future round; the adjusted Major Review schedule with the additional year will serve as the maximum time limit. Where an Assistant Professor has formally opted out of the additional year facility, their maximum time limit will be what it would have been prior to the adjustment made to the Major Review schedule, i.e. without the additional year.

Importantly, if candidates take advantage of the additional year facility, the expectation as regards productivity will not be higher.

2.4 Interim Review and Major Review in the Same Session

The Promotions Committee is prepared to consider requests from Heads of Department for an Assistant Professor to undergo Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor in the same academic session.

The two are separate processes. Candidates must pass Interim Review before they can be considered for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor.

2.5 Timing of Promotions

Promotions are considered annually in the Winter Term of each session.

After an unsuccessful promotion attempt, there will be a period of two years before another proposal will be considered by the Promotions Committee, unless the Promotions Committee itself decides to waive this rule in its decision on a given case. 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.

2.6 Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor in the Same Session

In very exceptional circumstances, the Promotions Committee is prepared to consider requests from Heads of Department for a post-Interim Review Assistant Professor to undergo Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and be proposed for a promotion to Professor in the same academic session. Heads of Department should consult the VCAC at their earliest opportunity before submitting any such proposal.

The two are separate processes. Candidates must pass Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor before they can be considered for promotion to Professor.

2.7 Deferral of Interim or Major Review

Deferral of Interim Review

The Promotions Committee is willing to consider deferral of Interim Review to a maximum of two years. A deferral of Interim Review does not change the scheduled date for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor. The following are examples of circumstances in which deferral may be agreed:

- Family-related absence.
- Personal circumstances which have disrupted normal duties that are not classified as an automatic interruption.
- Academic leave (for example buyout leave)
- A change in hours of work (for example a temporary period of part-time working or a permanent reduction in hours).
- Pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming.

An example of pertinent new information likely to be forthcoming is publications that are in "revise & resubmit" status, which if accepted for publication would significantly strengthen the candidate's publication record.

There is no presumption that an Assistant Professor will necessarily wish to request deferral if these or other circumstances arise. For example, where an Assistant Professor takes up a part-time appointment, the Head of Department's recommendation and decision of the Promotions Committee will have due regard to the Assistant Professor's hours of work.

A request for deferral is for the Assistant Professor to decide in the first instance, in consultation with their Head of Department. The Head of Department will consult with the Assistant Professor's Mentor and the Professors within the department. A request for deferral and the decision will not reflect unfavourably on an Assistant Professor's standing when a subsequent request is made to the Promotions Committee. Should the matter require further advice from Human Resources, the Department's HR Partner should be contacted.

The reasons for the deferral request should be set out by the Head of Department on the *Request to Defer Interim or Major Review Form G/5* and submitted with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Requests for deferral of Interim Review should ideally be submitted in time for the May review meeting of the Promotions Committee in the year prior to the candidate's scheduled Interim Review.

Certain events also result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the review clock) – see **Section 2.8** below.

Deferral of Major Review

A deferral of Interim Review does not change the scheduled date for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor. The scheduled date for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor can only be deferred for one year and only in exceptional cases where pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming. An example of pertinent new information likely to be forthcoming is publications that are in "revise & resubmit" status, which if accepted for publication would significantly strengthen the candidate's publication record.

The reasons for the deferral request should be set out by the Head of Department on the *Request to Defer Interim or Major Review Form G/5* and submitted together with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Requests for deferral of Major Review should ideally be submitted in time for the May review meeting of the Promotions Committee in the year prior to the candidate's scheduled Major Review

Certain events also result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the review clock) – see **Section 2.8** below.

2.8 Automatic Interruption and Stopping of Review 'Clock'

Family leave (i.e. maternity, adoption and shared parental leave) for an absence of 16 weeks or longer constitutes an automatic interruption (stopping of the clock) to an Assistant Professor's Interim and Major Review schedule. The timetable towards Interim and Major Review will be extended (pushed back) by one year to take account of leave of this nature.

Incapacity due to certificated long-term illness or disability will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and may also be designated as an automatic interruption, with the academic staff member's Review schedule updated accordingly. In these circumstances, both the Head of Department and the individual staff member are encouraged to be in contact with their HR Partner in the first instance at their earliest opportunity. Appropriate support (including reasonable adjustments where relevant) should first have been considered and implemented before a decision is taken to stop the review clock.

Heads of Department are not required to request deferral of Interim Review and/or Major

Review on grounds of leave of this kind. Once Human Resources has been informed of an academic staff member's intention to take family leave in accordance with the above, their Review schedule will be updated accordingly unless a member of staff specifically requests that the session date for their Interim Review and/or Major Review should remain as under the original timescale. Following notification that a member of staff will be taking family leave, Human Resources will inform the member of staff of the provision for extension and ascertain their wishes regarding the session date for Interim and/or Major Review. Human Resources will inform the candidate's Head of Department of any proposed change to the timing of Interim or Major Review following the candidate's response. Incapacity due to certificated long-term illness or disability will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis and will follow the same procedure as family leave above.

A one-year interruption in progress towards Interim or Major Review on grounds of leave of this kind will not preclude Heads of Department from submitting a request for deferral of Interim or Major Review on other grounds in a subsequent year, should that be considered necessary. Likewise, it does not prevent candidates from being put forward for Interim or Major Review before their newly scheduled review time.

2.9 Out-of-phase Retention Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor 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 9.5 – Emergency Procedures.**

3. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION

3.1 Aim of Interim Review

The aim of the Interim Review is to assess the Assistant Professor's progress during the early part of their appointment; to confirm whether they are making good progress in a direction that will lead to a successful Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor; and to ensure that they are receiving appropriate career development support from the Department.

The Interim Review is designed to enable the Promotions Committee to evaluate the candidate's promise and early achievements in research and publications, the viability of their future research and publication trajectory, their commitment to quality (including innovation as appropriate) and success in teaching and student support, and their contribution to citizenship/service within the Department and across the School.

Note that new recruits with appropriate teaching experience and a record of publications may be appointed post-Interim Review.

3.2 Criteria for Interim Review

In considering Interim Reviews the Promotions Committee will evaluate the candidate's activities with respect to research and publications, teaching, and contributions to the Department.
The criteria for Interim Review under the New Academic Career structure are as follows:

- Evidence of an emerging research programme with 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.
- Publication of research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books. Candidates should normally present two research publications, though this is not a binding requirement.
- A coherent and feasible plan for future work towards Major Review.
- Evidence of high-quality teaching.
- Successful completion of the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification.
- Evidence of constructive contributions to the life of the Department

The Promotions Committee will base its decision on the following:

- A CV presented on the standard template including (i) a detailed and self-evaluative statement on the candidate's contributions to education, (ii) a detailed statement of the candidate's research and publication achievements and plans, including an approximate schedule for completion of projects, any planned grant applications, projected publication outlets, and proposals for dissemination, and (iii) a statement from the candidate on their contributions to citizenship within the Department and across the School.
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department. Departments should inform the Promotions Committee about the typical lag between submission, review, and publication in the field's journals, the relative importance of books and journal articles, and relevant aspects of recruitment procedures, in order to allow judgement on an appropriate combination of published works and evaluation of evidence of the research trajectory and quality. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the Career Development Review (CDR) process.
- Candidates who due to the rules on the timing of Interim Review (see **Sec. 2.1**) must come up for review and do so without support of the Department are permitted (but not required) to submit the Candidate's Statement (For Candidates Considered for Promotion without Departmental Support) G/7.School student teaching survey results.
- 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.

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

3.3 Failure at Interim Review

If a candidate is put forward for Interim Review before their scheduled Interim Review date (as stated in their letter of appointment unless this date became automatically postponed or deferred – see **Sections 2.7** and **2.8**) and the Promotions Committee is not willing to pass the candidate, the Committee will **neither pass nor fail** the candidate but rule that the application is premature and should be resubmitted in a future round (but in any case no later than the scheduled Interim Review date).

In all other cases, should a member of staff fail to meet the requirements of Interim Review, the process following the Promotions Committee's decision is discussed in **Section 9.4 – Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review**.

3.4 Aim of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

The Promotions Committee conducts a Major Review when the Assistant Professor is to be considered for a permanent appointment with promotion to the role of Associate Professor. The procedure is designed to evaluate the extent of the Assistant Professor's success and promise in research and scholarship, their academic merit and professional standing generally, the extent of their commitment and success in teaching, and the extent to which they have made a contribution to the work of the Department and the School. Under Promotions Committee procedures, there is **no self-sponsored route** for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor.

3.5 Criteria for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor (and Promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Assistant Professors)

Success at Major Review under the New Academic Career structure will lead to promotion to Associate Professor. Post-Major Review Assistant Professors can be put forward for promotion to Associate Professor. Should they fail to secure departmental support, such candidates can also put themselves forward for a self-sponsored promotion to Associate Professor. The criteria for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Assistant Professors are the same but the latter do not undergo Major Review again. There is no promotion route under the old career structure.

Departmental nominations for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor can be made as soon or as late as may be required for a Department to form a judgement on the quality of a candidate's work and broader contributions to the School. Normally this will be within eight years of the appointment date (see **Section 2.2)**, although this date can become automatically postponed under certain circumstances (see **Section 2.8**). In addition, exceptionally a deferral of a maximum of one year can be requested where pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming (see **Section 2.7**).

The criteria for Major Review under the New Academic Career structure/promotion to Associate Professor 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. 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.
- 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.

It may also be evidenced by:

- Success in obtaining external research funds, especially in peer-reviewed processes.
- Research impacts and/or success in bringing research-based knowledge to broader publics.
- Contributions to School Research Centres or Institutes (where appropriate).

The Promotions Committee does not require evidence of successful grant applications for promotion, but it does recognise that applying for research grants involves an additional peer-review process, and that, where funding is necessary in order to gather data, publications may take longer to produce.

Strong and very high-quality teaching.

A candidate should demonstrate success in the classroom and advising, and a commitment to the education of LSE students. This will normally be evidenced by:

- A record of high-quality teaching as evaluated by students and colleagues.
- Demonstrated ability to contribute in important ways to LSE programmes, ideally at undergraduate, postgraduate, and research student levels.
- Demonstrated willingness to work to improve teaching.
- Contributions to course design and development.
- Successful completion of the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification (if appointed prior to 2014-15, or if appointed post-Interim Review. Although it is expected that Post-Major Review Lecturers being considered for promotion to Associate Professor who passed their Major Review prior to 2014-15 have successfully completed the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification, it is not a requirement)
- A statement of how the candidate approaches teaching, how they aim to do the best for LSE students, what they consider strengths and weaknesses and how they propose to improve on the weaknesses.

Contributions to departmental and/or School governance and administration.

These may be evidenced by:

- Service in departmental administration, including course administration.
- Service to interdisciplinary programmes, Institutes, or Centres.
- Service on School-wide committees or in other governance roles.
- Contributions to other School projects and agendas such as public engagement.

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 including a statement from the candidate on their contributions to education, a research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement from the candidate on their contributions to citizenship.
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department and/or the School including, where relevant, comments on any teaching observations carried out by the Head of Department or their nominee. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) process.
- Candidates who due to the rules on the timing of Major Review (see **Sec. 2.2**) must come up for review and do so without support of the Department are permitted (but not required) to submit the Candidate's Statement (For Candidates Considered for Promotion without Departmental Support) G/7.
- Eden Centre Teaching Observation Report, if deemed a requirement by the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), the Pro-Director (Education) and the VCAC.

- School student survey results.
- 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 work nominated by the candidate.
- Evidence from external peer review.

Citation Evidence in Major Review 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 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).

If citation evidence is provided, three sets of citation counts -- Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science (formerly Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)) counts -- must be provided. The Library can assist candidates in putting their citation counts together (please contact Paul Flannery, Research Information Analyst at Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk).

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

3.6 Failure at Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

If a candidate is put forward for Major Review before their scheduled Major Review date (as stated in their letter of appointment or, for those who were appointed under the old career structure, as specified in their letter confirming their opt-in to the New Academic Career structure, unless this date became automatically postponed or deferred – see **Sections 2.7 and 2.8**), and the Promotions Committee is not willing to pass the candidate, the Committee will **neither pass nor fail** the candidate but rule that the application is premature and should be resubmitted in a future round (but no later than their scheduled Major Review date).

In all other cases, should a member of staff fail to meet the requirements of Major Review, the process following the Promotions Committee's decision is discussed in **Section 9.4 – Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review**.

3.7 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

Promotion to professorial status comes in recognition of major accomplishments in research and publications combined with excellence in teaching, including advising and mentoring, and growing participation in administration and governance.

Candidates for promotion to Professor 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, candidates will show strong contributions to teaching. Ideally these will include not only excellence in individual teaching but also leadership in teaching (for example, in mentoring more junior teachers or in course development and improvement). 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 Professor 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 criteria for promotion are:

- A substantial body of published research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books. Candidates should present four research publications, 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 Major Review. For candidates appointed to the School post-Major Review, submitted publications should have been published after the equivalent of Major Review in their previous appointment. 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.
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions.
- A record of successful and innovative teaching at all levels, including a track record of successful PhD supervision, subject to candidates having appropriate opportunities to engage in PhD supervision. The Promotions Committee recognises that opportunities for supervision can be limited. In such cases, the Committee will place weight on evidence of a record of MSc dissertation supervision, mentoring of post-doctoral Fellows, or similar forms of engagement. Evidence of management capabilities as demonstrated by significant contributions to departmental and School administration.
- Contribution to the development and performance of colleagues through coaching, mentoring and peer support.

The Promotions Committee will also take account of the following:

- Leadership in scholarly initiatives in relevant disciplinary or interdisciplinary communities– e.g., editorship of journals, membership of committees in professional associations, appointment to significant research bodies, and government/international advisory committees.
- A record of securing peer-reviewed research funds and where appropriate, contributions to School Research Centres.
- Research impacts and/or success in bringing research-based knowledge to broader publics.

The Promotions Committee does not require evidence of successful grant applications for promotion, but it does recognise that applying for research grants involves an additional peer-review process, and that, where funding is necessary in order to gather data, publications may take longer to produce.

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 separate statements from the candidate on (i) their contributions to education, (ii) their research achievement record, (iii) planned research and (iv) contributions to citizenship.
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's research, teaching and contributions to the Department and the School and the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) process.
- Eden Centre Teaching Observation Report, if deemed a requirement by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) and the VCAC.
- School student survey results.
- 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 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).

If citation evidence is provided, three sets of citation counts -- Google Scholar, Scopus and Web of Science (formerly Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI)) counts -- must be provided. The Library can assist candidates in putting their citation counts together (please contact Library.Bibliometrics@lse.ac.uk).

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

3.8 Unsuccessful promotion proposals

The process following the Promotions Committee's decision is discussed in **Section 9 – Decisions of the Promotions Committee**.

4. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

4.1 Functions of the Head of Department

The principal functions of the Head of Department in relation to Interim Review and Major Review and promotion of academic staff are:

- To ensure that all non-Professorial academic staff receive constructive advice on career development, and that the Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme (available on the Human Resources website) and mentoring schemes operate effectively at department level.
- To keep under review with departmental Professorial colleagues the progress of Assistant Professors towards Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and the possible claims to promotion of all Associate Professors and, where relevant, post-Major Review Assistant Professors.
- To be responsible for the submission of proposals for Interim Review, Major Review and promotion to Professor to the Promotions Committee, including the nomination of referees, who the Head of Department must confirm are willing to serve prior to submitting the nomination form.

The timetable can be found at **Annex C** and a reference guide to the Review deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**. The Criteria for Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor, can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 9 – Procedures**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the Human Resources website.

4.2 Administrative workload of pre-Interim Review Assistant Professors

Normally, pre-Interim Review Assistant Professors should not be asked to carry heavy administrative workloads.

4.3 Research Student Supervision of Assistant Professors

The School's *Regulations for Research Degrees* states that the Departmental Doctoral Programme Director has responsibility for ensuring that pre-Major Review members of staff do not have lead supervisory responsibility for research students.

4.4 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are responsible for the electronic submission of all documentation listed in **Sections 4.2**, **4.5** and **4.7** concerning Review and departmentally-sponsored Promotion proposals to the Promotions Committee via Human Resources, except the Eden Centre Teaching Report where relevant. It follows that Heads of Department are expected to take an active role in advising candidates on their completed *CV Template G/2*. Heads of Department 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).

4.5 Departmental Support for Review and Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate

Departments are strongly encouraged to issue guidelines to their Assistant Professors and Associate Professors regarding the timing, process and criteria by which the Department's Professoriate decides on whether to provide departmental support for review and promotion candidates. Such guidelines require the approval of the VCAC and the VPFD. In the event of any conflict or inconsistency between this document and the departmental guidance, this document should be regarded as definitive.

The Head of Department's Statement should be based on the information submitted to and

considered by the department's Professoriate. The *Head of Department's Statement G/1* should make clear which members of the department's Professoriate were involved in the discussion leading to the decision to recommend the Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors only) or promotion to Professor. The Committee expects that a decision will be taken based on a vote by all serving Professors, and that the *Head of Department's Statement G/1* will indicate the numbers voting for and against as well as those abstaining.

A candidate cannot normally be put forward for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor before their normally scheduled Major Review in accordance with **Section 2.2** unless they have 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 G/1*.

Departments may solicit external references to inform their decision on whether to support a candidate for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and/or a candidate for promotion to Professor. 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 8.2** 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 referees should be asked 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 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.

4.6 Head of Department's Role in Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

Heads of Department are asked to give as much information as possible to Major Review candidates about the timetable and the procedures to be followed, and to emphasise that the Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor is not a competitive exercise but an assessment of whether an individual meets the standards set by the School for a permanent appointment.

In all but the most exceptional cases, Heads of Department are expected to be sufficiently *au fait* with the work of their junior colleagues that they are able to defend Major Review candidates if called upon to do so by the Promotions Committee.

4.7 Head of Department's Statement for Interim Review

.

The *Head of Department's Statement G/1* on candidates for Interim Review is the most important piece of evidence considered by the Promotions Committee. The statement should provide an evaluative commentary on the candidate's academic profile, with particular emphasis on teaching, research and publication strategy, contributions to departmental administration and any other relevant professional activities. The statement should look forward to the Major Review, commenting on the candidate's planned trajectory to meet the criteria for a successful Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor. Departments should inform the Promotions Committee about the typical lag between submission, review, and publication in the field's journals, the relative importance of books and journal articles, and relevant aspects of recruitment procedures, to allow judgement on an appropriate combination

of published works and evaluation of evidence of the research trajectory and quality.

The statement should also confirm that CDR meetings have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and any relevant issues raised in the meetings (see **Section 1.13** on the CDR and Mentoring).

The Promotions Committee would expect that should the Head of Department have any serious concerns regarding the Assistant Professor's prospects for a successful Interim Review, the Head of Department would have sought the advice of the VCAC and, if appropriate, an HR Partner at an earlier stage.

For candidates holding joint appointments across two departments, where one of the appointments is at least at 0.3 FTE, the head of the 'secondary' department is required to submit a short statement, in addition to co-signing the *Head of Department's Statement G/1*

4.8 The Head of Department's Statement for Major Review and Promotion

The Promotions Committee views the Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor as one of the most important decisions for the School. The evidence in the Head of Department's Statement G/1 is of particular weight. The Promotions Committee expects Heads of Department to address the following areas in their reports on candidates:

1. *Academic Profile:*

   A full evaluative commentary on the candidate's academic profile, across the range of research, teaching, administration and other professional activities, as evidenced by the curriculum vitae, ensuring detail is provided to inform the Promotions Committee's decision.

2. *Research Productivity and Excellence:*

   The Head of Department should indicate their 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 is expected to comment in detail on the quality of each of the publications submitted to the Promotions Committee.** Where possible, they should comment specifically on the originality of the candidate's intellectual contribution (noting that this may be especially important in cases where work is co-authored and the individual contribution of the candidate may not be obvious to readers).

   The Head of Department 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.
   - Whether being a PhD supervisor is sine qua non (see **section 3.7** on the PhD supervision criteria for promotion).
   - 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 and Publishing Norms documents, 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:

Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context (see **Section 3.7** for details). 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).

3. *Teaching Quality:*

The Head of Department should provide a detailed and comprehensive account of the candidate's overall teaching profile including:

- Volume of teaching, including an indication of the candidate's role on each course and the student numbers.
- Breadth of teaching: whether the candidate's teaching is all related to their area of research or whether they are required to teach a broader range of subject matter.
- Evidence of teaching performance: feedback from students, including responses to the School survey, and feedback from colleagues in the Eden Centre. Along with the strengths in their teaching, any weaknesses along with the steps that have been taken and are planned to address them.
- Other matters: any issues relating to variability of teaching scores or any other matters in the School survey data which may need explanation/interpretation.
- Involvement in innovation: to include innovation in terms of both curriculum content (e.g. development of new courses or key role in course revision) and delivery methods.
- Involvement in personal development as a teacher, and/or in the support and development of others: evidence of involvement in training, beyond the "minimum expectations" and/or mentoring, GTA support, involvement in central or departmental staff development as provider rather than participant.

When referring to any teaching course, Heads of Department are requested to state the full course name and course code.

Heads of Department should ensure that all relevant evidence is provided in the Contributions to Education section of the candidate's *CV Template G/2*, and that any weaknesses are discussed fully by the candidate and the Head of Department along with the steps that have been taken and are planned to address them. The Promotions Committee will also have before it School student survey results for up to the four previous sessions but not the current session as they are not available in time.

Departmental Teaching Observations
The Departmental Teaching Observation is not required, however if it is considered beneficial for the candidate, a Head of Department may wish to carry one out. In the case that a Head of Department carries out an observation, the report should be submitted on the observation form G/4.

4. *Service to the Department and the School:*

The Head of Department should provide their opinion of the candidate's contribution to the work of the School, whether at Departmental level or in the wider School context, for example evidence of good citizenship through service on departmental/School committees or holding School offices.

5. *Career Development:*

The Head of Department should confirm that Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) meetings have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and the Department's expectations for future career progression.

Heads of Department are encouraged to seek advice from the VPFD and/or VCAC in cases where they have concerns about the career progression of members of staff.

6. For candidates holding joint appointments across two departments, where one of the appointments is at least at 0.3 FTE, the head of the 'secondary' department is required to submit a short statement, in addition to co-signing the *Head of Department's Statement G/1.*

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

Associate Professors wishing to propose themselves for promotion to Professor or post- Major Review Assistant Professors wishing to propose themselves for promotion to Associate Professor on a self-sponsored basis are strongly encouraged to discuss this with the VCAC well in advance of the relevant deadlines.

They 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 9**. Template forms, 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 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 their statement on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

4.10 Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement

The Promotions Committee expects self-sponsored candidates to frame their reports with the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Assistant Professors only) or promotion to Professor in mind.

5 CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

5.1 Self-evaluative commentary

The Promotions Committee puts much emphasis on a detailed and self-evaluative Contribution to Education statement submitted by candidates and supporting evidence as an addendum to the *CV Template G/2*. This statement should be around 2,000 words; additional evidence can be placed in a concise appendix.

Candidates should present a case for how they fulfil the following criteria for the relevant review or promotion stage they are considered for.

Interim Review
- Evidence of high-quality teaching.
- Successful completion of the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification.

Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor
- A record of high-quality teaching as evaluated by students and colleagues.
- Successful completion of the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification (if appointed in 2014-15 or later).
- Demonstrated ability to contribute in important ways to LSE programmes, ideally at undergraduate, postgraduate, and research student levels.
- Demonstrated willingness to work to improve teaching.
- Contributions to course design and development.

Promotion to Professor
- A record of successful and innovative teaching at all levels, including a track record of successful PhD or other research student or junior researcher supervision (see **section 3.7** on the PhD supervision criteria for promotion).
- Evidence of management capabilities as demonstrated by significant contributions to departmental and School administration.
- Contribution to the development and performance of colleagues through coaching, mentoring and peer support.

To address the criteria, all candidates should discuss their approach to teaching, learning and assessment. They may also wish to refer to and address some of the following in writing their statement (note that some of these will inevitably be more relevant for candidates for promotion to Professor as they are further along in their careers):

- Evidence of engagement with student diversity and discussion of notable successes and/or challenges in terms of teaching.
- Diversity of teaching and learning approaches and tools used by the individual and extent to which they introduce new ideas.
- Use of teaching development funding from the Eden Centre//other + evidence of evaluation and decision regarding next steps.
- Evidence of dissemination related to teaching (e.g., blog/article/report/Teaching Symposium contribution).
- Their involvement in course and curriculum development.
- Evidence of leadership roles – e.g., in course, programme, examinations, student selection, academic mentoring, work with GTAs, colleague mentoring, external programmes, committee contributions.
- Feedback from GTAs/others working with the individual.
- Education prizes.
- External grant funding for teaching development – with evidence of outcomes.
- Conference presentations/journal articles related to pedagogy.

- Authorship or editorship of textbooks.
- Engagement in personal/professional development in relation to teaching.
- External recognition e.g., external examining; visiting lecturing; membership of review panels in other universities.
- Leadership/advisory roles on national/international HE teaching developments discipline/national teaching-related prizes/commendations.
- Any additional circumstances that they would like the Promotions Committee to be aware of, including a disability or other condition that may have impacted on their teaching and/or education contributions (see **Section 1.6 – Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances**).

Candidates should note that the Promotions Committee has access to TQARO student survey results, as well as (where relevant) Departmental and Eden Centre observation reports.

The Promotions Committee is aware of the limitations of using TQARO student survey results as a means of evaluating contributions to education. The Committee seeks to evaluate teaching and wider contributions to education in a holistic way and TQARO student survey results form only one part of the evidence base relating to contributions to education. The Promotions Committee reserves the right to approach the candidate's Head of Department to request that any evidence of poor teaching should be addressed.

The VCAC is responsible for follow-up actions on behalf of the Promotions Committee regarding any issues of concern identified by the Committee in relation to the teaching performance of individual members of staff.

5.2 Teaching Observations

Departmental Teaching Observation

A Departmental Teaching Observation is not a requirement for review and promotion candidates, however, should it be considered beneficial for a candidate, a Head of Department may wish to carry out an observation. In the case that a Departmental Teaching Observation is carried out, the *Departmental Teaching Observation Form G/4* form should contain an evaluative commentary of the candidate’s teaching as observed by the Head of Department or their delegate.

Eden Centre Teaching Observation

Human Resources is responsible for notifying the Eden Centre of the schedule of Major Reviews, Promotions and Self-Sponsored Promotions each session and will liaise with the Eden Centre to arrange the submission of reports. The Eden Centre will only conduct Teaching Observations where there are concerns about a candidate’s teaching scores and when the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development), Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor) (Education) and the VCAC deem it to be a requirement.

In the case where a Teaching Observation is considered necessary, the Eden Centre observer should arrange a short meeting or make contact by email with the teacher before the session to ascertain and clarify the objectives for the session and obtain background on the student group.

The observer and teacher should review the Teaching Observation form together and note areas of observation to be highlighted. The observer should also ask the teacher whether there is any aspect they would like feedback on.

The observer should arrange a debrief with the teacher after the session. It will be expected that the observer will let the teacher see the feedback before it is submitted to Human

Resources on the Teaching Observation form. The teacher will be free to append comments.

Advice should be sought from the Eden Centre in cases where the teaching observation raises any issues of concern or where further support may be required - for example, training/coaching/other forms of support. Where appropriate, the Head of Department may request that a further teaching observation be conducted by the Eden Centre. It is expected that departments will be proactive in seeking advice from the Eden Centre in this regard.

Recommendations for any follow-up action - including training/coaching/other forms of support should be recorded on the Teaching Observation form.

5.3 LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Requirement

All new career-track staff appointed from the 2009-10 session to the 2010-11 session with fewer than three years' higher education teaching experience and who have not completed an equivalent programme elsewhere are expected to complete the Full Fellowship level of the LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCertHE).

All new career-track staff appointed from the 2011-12 session to the 2013-14 session with less than three years' teaching experience and who have not completed and passed an equivalent programme elsewhere are expected to undertake, complete and *pass* the Full Fellowship level of the LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCertHE) *prior* to being considered for *Major Review*.

All new career-track staff appointed from the 2014-15 session onwards who are contractually required to undertake, complete and pass the Full Fellowship level of the LSE PGCertHE must do so *prior* to being considered for *Interim Review*.

All new career-track staff appointed post-Interim Review from the 2014-15 session onwards are required to undertake, complete and pass the Full Fellowship level of the LSE PGCertHE *prior* to being considered for *Major Review*.

For further information, see the PGCertHE website.

6 CONTRIBUTIONS TO CITIZENSHIP

6.1 Self-evaluative commentary

The Promotions Committee puts much emphasis on a detailed and self-evaluative Contribution to Citizenship statement submitted by candidates and supporting evidence as an addendum to the *CV Template G/2*. This addendum to the CV template relevant section of the CV template should be no more than 2 pages for candidates for Interim Review and Major Review, and no more than 4 pages for candidates for Promotion to Professor; additional evidence can be placed in an appendix.

All staff are expected to fulfil the responsibilities that come with their roles, such as being an available and supportive academic mentor (including replying to student emails in a timely manner and writing references); taking part in departmental meetings; and meeting all departmental deadlines.
Academic citizenship also involves that staff members participating actively in the smooth running of their department and the School, making a contribution to their discipline and to society. Being a good academic citizen is about how someone works as well as being about what they do. All academic staff are expected to uphold the School's values and its commitment to ensuring that the School is a truly inclusive university.

Academic citizenship within the School typically encompasses the following activities across the course of a person's career:

- Contributing to the development and realisation of the strategic goals of their department and the School.
- Taking on leadership and management roles appropriate to their position and doing them well.
- Taking on departmental and School administrative roles appropriate to their position and doing them well.
- Volunteering to sit on department and School committees and working groups and making a positive contribution to them.
- Mentoring less experienced colleagues.
- Covering for colleagues when necessary.
- Attending and taking part in departmental seminars, PhD seminars and PhD upgrade events.
- Attending and taking part in widening participation activities, open days, welcoming activities, student events, graduation ceremonies and alumni events.
- Playing an active role in staff recruitment by serving on appointment panels and attending job talks.
- Promoting equity, diversity and inclusion in all aspects of one's role at the School.
- For Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, there must be evidence of sustained contributions o departmental administration and to School-wide activities.
- For promotion to full Professor, there must be evidence of sustained, significant contributions to departmental and School-wide strategic management and governance.
- Outside of LSE, staff are expected to take on citizenship roles appropriate to their level of seniority within the academy, such as engaging with external funding bodies, taking on journal editorship roles, and serving as a peer-reviewer and referee.

7 CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS

7.1 Work cited on the CV

The Promotions Committee reserves the right to request copies of any work cited on the *CV Template G/2*.

All candidates are asked to state clearly on the CV the stage all their publications have 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 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 the editors' confirmation email inviting the candidate to revise and resubmit the piece. Any reviews of books submitted as part of a case, whether favourable or not, should also be submitted.

The dated electronic signatures of the candidate and Head of Department on the *CV Template G/2* are required as confirmation that the information provided is accurate.

7.2 Work submitted for Interim Review

Unless there are exceptional circumstances, candidates must present **two** research publications. Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department.

Candidates undergoing Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor in the same session should mark clearly on their CV which two of the four submitted writings should be considered for Interim Review only. All four writings will be considered for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor.

7.3 Work submitted for Major Review or Promotion

In addition to the criteria for Major Review or Promotion (**Sections 3.5 and 3.7**, respectively) relating to writings, the following should be noted. A central part of the Promotions Committee's process is that written work submitted with a review and/or promotions case will be read and commented on in detail. Referees are also asked to read and comment in detail on the submitted writings. Therefore, careful consideration should be given by candidates to the selection of writings and it is strongly recommended that they should seek advice from senior colleagues about this selection.

For promotion to Professor cases, candidates must submit **four** research publications, unless there are exceptional circumstances. The submitted writings should, other than in exceptional cases, not have been used as outputs submitted for Major Review. Invoking such exceptional circumstances (as regards the number of writings or as regards Major Review submissions) requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department. For candidates appointed to the School post-Major Review, submitted publications should have been published after the equivalent of Major Review in their previous appointment. In addition, all submitted items for promotion to Professor cases must be published or have been accepted for publication.

For all other review and promotion cases, candidates must submit **four** research publications, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department. The expectation is that submitted pieces will be published or have been accepted for publication (accompanied by a confirmation letter / 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. Candidates are asked to explain on their CV the rationale for selecting the writings submitted in support of Major Review and/or promotion and how the selected items relate to one another.

Co-authorship
The Committee is looking for evidence of a leading or major contribution across all pieces 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 proportion of intellectual contribution made to the work. 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. The submission of multiple chapters of the same book as separate works should be avoided.

Publication language

The expectation is that publications submitted in support of Major Review and/or promotion will be written in English.

In cases where a publication(s) submitted for Major Review or promotion 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 referees able to read the work in the original language.

Presentation of Writings
- 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.
- Large manuscripts should be drilled and treasury-tagged and not submitted loose-leaf.

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.

8 EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

The Promotions Committee solicits external peer review advice from Referees as part of its decision-making process for Major Review and promotion cases. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will only accept comments that have been formally solicited.

It is the responsibility of the Head of Department to ensure that, prior to nomination, all Referees are willing to be contacted by the VCAC and to participate in the process. The Head of Department should notify potential Referees that they will be expected to comment specifically and in detail on each of the candidate's submitted writings if they are asked by the VCAC to participate in the process.

All Referees 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 the number of nominations of Referees can be found at **Annex E**.

A reference guide to the documentation shared with Referees can be found at **Annex F**.

8.1 Role of External Referees in the Review and 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 academics from the same cohort in the candidate's field. Referees are not sent the *Head of Department Statement G/1*.

Interim Review

External peer review is **not normally part** of the Interim Review procedure. However, if a case is submitted without departmental support, **four** names are required; two are to be nominated by the candidate and two by the VCAC. In addition, where there is departmental support, if a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee are doubtful about the Head of Department's recommendation, the Committee may ask the Head of Department to suggest the names of external Referees for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Where it considers it appropriate, the Promotions Committee may canvass the views of one or more such outside Referees.

Referees for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor, Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Assistant Professors only) and Promotion to Professor

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of external Referees for each candidate on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/3*. Normally, **eight** names are required in total; four are to be nominated by the Department and four by the candidate. The Promotions Committee will seek references from at least four of the eight nominated external Referees.

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

Referees for Self-Sponsored Promotion

Self-sponsored candidates are required to provide the names of external referees on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/3*. Normally, candidates should nominate four external Referees; an additional four external Referees are to be nominated

by the VCAC.

To further 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 or other Professors. 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 8.2**) are not met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

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

Referees for Emergency Major Review and/or Promotion

Heads of Department are normally required to provide the names of **two** departmentally-sponsored external referees on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/3*, 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.

8.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees

- All Referees should be employed by a distinguished university.
- Referees should be confined to those of full Professorial (or Emeritus Professorial) status or equivalent.
- The nomination of more than one Referee from the same Department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- Wherever appropriate Referees should be of international standing and active in research publication in the appropriate field.
- 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, normally, include people who have co-authored or acted as co-investigators with the candidate in the past four years. Heads of Department should seek the advice of the VCAC for disciplines where joint authorship or collaboration is the norm and where co-authors or co-investigators may be best placed to act as Referees.
- The naming of Referees should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.
- 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.

Exceptions to the above criteria may be considered by the VCAC and VPFD in instances where the criteria were to cause an exceptional limitation on the available referees. Any decisions would remain at the discretion of the VCAC and VPFD. Heads of Department will be expected to provide written justification in any case where these requirements cannot be met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

8.3 Confidentiality

Referees are advised that any reference provided in connection with the Major Review and/or Promotion processes will be confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Review and Promotion processes. The references are not normally disclosed to Major Review and/or Promotion candidates or to Heads of Departments. However, in circumstances such as a Major Review appeal hearing, grievance or legal proceedings, references may have to be disclosed to a third party.

9 PROCEDURES OF THE REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS

9.1 Procedure for Interim Review or Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

The core format of Interim Review and Major Review is that a recommendation from the Assistant Professor's Head of Department on whether the Assistant Professor should pass the relevant Review is made to the Promotions Committee, which then makes the decision based on the evidence in front of it. It is a basic School principle that departmental recommendations are subject to assessment and evaluation by Professors from other departments. It is therefore open to the Promotions Committee either to endorse the Head of Department's recommendation, to reject it, or to defer the decision subject to the maximum time limits as set out in **Section 2.1** (in the case of Interim Review) **and 2.2** (in the case of an Assistant Professor's Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor).

The detailed procedure for Interim Review and/or Major Review comprises the following stages:

1. *Notification from Human Resources*

   Assistant Professors scheduled to undergo a Review will receive notification from Human Resources prior to the academic session in which the Review is expected to take place informing them of the forthcoming procedure and enclosing a copy of these Guidelines and where documentation can be located on the Human Resources website.

2. *Consultation between Head of Department and staff member*

   The Assistant Professor has the opportunity to submit to their Head of Department any information that they consider relevant, or to ask for a deferral of the Review. The Head of Department will offer the opportunity of a meeting or will be given the opportunity to submit a written statement about their work which the Head of Department will use in preparation of their statement to the Promotions Committee. This discussion or written information should include any relevant personal circumstances of the candidate that either the Head of Department or the candidate feels the Promotions Committee should take into account An agreement should be reached on what the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, the Head of Department should declare on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/6*. For further information about individual circumstances see **Section 1.6**. The Head of Department should give the Assistant Professor a reasonable period of notice in either case.

3. *Documentation submission by Head of Department*

   If, after appropriate consultations with colleagues and consideration of the information provided by the Assistant Professor subject to Review, the Head of Department is of the view that the required level of progress is being made towards Major Review (for Interim Review candidates) or that they should pass Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor (for Major Review candidates), the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee on the *Head of Department Statement G/1* recommending that the individual should pass their Interim Review or Major Review.

   For Interim Review candidates, if, after the consultations and consideration referred to above, the Head of Department is of the view that the Assistant Professor is not making the required level of progress towards Major Review and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit for Interim Review has been reached, the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee setting out the reasons and reporting on the Assistant Professor's progress and activities in research and publication, teaching, and service to the School. In addition to their statement, the Head of Department will be asked to suggest the names of external referees for the Promotions Committee's consideration using the relevant template form, as outlined in **Section 8.1**.

   For Major Review candidates, if, after the consultations and consideration referred to above,

the Head of Department cannot recommend that the Assistant Professor pass Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit for Major Review has been reached, the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee setting out the reasons and reporting on the Assistant Professor's progress and activities as above.

4. *Additional information:*

If, in the period between the Head of Department submitting their statement and the Promotions Committee considering the case, any new information arises which the candidate/Head of Department wishes to be considered by the Promotions Committee, the candidate/Head of Department should submit the information to Human Resources for onward transmission to the Committee.

5. *Decision of the Promotions Committee:*

The Promotions Committee will consider each recommendation individually and then reach a decision whether the Assistant Professor should pass their Interim and/or Major Review.

Interim Review

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that an Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements, the Assistant Professor concerned will pass Interim Review. A decision to defer Interim Review will be taken only where the Promotions Committee considers that either the School or the Assistant Professor, or both, would benefit from the Promotions Committee having the possibility to consider the Assistant Professor's position again after the deferral (and so offering scope, where relevant, for any material coming into being during the period of the deferral to be considered by the Promotions Committee). The Promotions Committee may ask the VCAC to maintain a watching brief on progress.

In the case of Interim Review, if a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee are doubtful about the Head of Department's recommendation, the Committee may ask the Head of Department to suggest the names of external referees for the Promotions Committee's consideration. The Promotions Committee may canvass the views of one or more such outside referees.

Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

At the Major Review stage, the progress of an Assistant Professor will be considered in terms of the elements outlined in **Section 3.5**. The Promotions Committee will consider the Assistant Professor's contribution in its entirety, taking into account progress made since they passed Interim Review. If the Assistant Professor was appointed subject to Major Review only, the Promotions Committee will consider the Assistant Professor's progress since their appointment at the School. Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees (for Major Review and promotion cases only) and of the internal opinions as expressed in the *Head of Department's Statement G/1* and the opinion of the Internal Reader assigned to assess the candidate's publications as well as the Internal Monitor.

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that an Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements, then they pass Major Review.

Promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Assistant Professors

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a post-Major Review Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor, the staff member concerned will be promoted to Associate Professor.

Promotion to Professor

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that an Associate Professor fulfils the requirements for promotion to Professor, the staff member concerned will be promoted to Professor.

9.2 Consideration of Interim Review, Major Review and Promotion Cases

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 - Outstanding case
B - I am confident in my judgement that this case clearly meets the criteria for review and/or promotion
C - Merits full discussion by Committee.
D - Case looks inadequate – merits full discussion by Committee.

Role of Promotions Committee Monitors

All Major Review and/or 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 3.5** and **3.7**. The Monitor does not read the candidate's submitted pieces as a matter of routine, although copies of writings are made available to all members of the Promotions Committee.

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 they 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 either category 'C' or '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.

9.3 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.

Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can be found on the Human Resources website.

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 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 their statement 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 Referees, of the internal opinions as expressed in the promotion proposal, and the opinions of the Internal Reader and Internal Monitor assigned to assess the candidate's publications.

9.4 Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review

In cases where candidates have been put forward before their scheduled Interim or Major Review date, and the Promotions Committee is not willing to pass the candidate, the procedure outlined under, respectively, **Sections 3.3 or 3.6** will apply. In all other cases, should a member of staff fail to meet the requirements of Interim or Major Review, the candidate and their Head of Department will be advised of this decision in writing.

In such circumstances the member of staff will be invited in writing to attend a formal hearing to discuss the matter by their Head of Department.

The hearing will be chaired by either the VPFD or another Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor, with the VCAC, the Head of Department and HR Partner also present.

This hearing will be to explain the circumstances and decision of the Promotions Committee. The staff member will be given the opportunity to respond to the outcome of the Promotions Committee, before a final decision is made regarding termination of employment (as they have failed to pass the School's academic probationary process).

Right to Be Accompanied

The academic member of staff may be accompanied at the hearing by a companion employed by the School or a trade union representative. This companion may speak on the academic member of staff's behalf but may not answer questions addressed directly to the academic member of staff.

It is the academic member of staff's responsibility to notify the chosen companion of the details of the hearing including the date, time and location of the hearings as well any relevant documentation relating to the case.

Academic members of staff are requested to give notice of the name and relevant details of any companion to the HR Partner at least 3 working days prior to a hearing under this procedure.

If the companion is not available at the time proposed for the hearing, the academic member of staff may request that the hearing is postponed once to another reasonable time not being later than 5 working days after the date first proposed for the hearing.

Procedure

The Head of Department will write to the academic member of staff setting out the reasons for the proposed termination of the employee's employment in line with the decision reached by the Promotions Committee and invite the employee to a hearing. The academic member of staff will have the opportunity to respond at the hearing before any decision is taken and will be provided with copies of any relevant documentation to be considered at the hearing.

The academic member of staff will be advised of the right to be accompanied by a companion employed by the School or a trade union representative.

Following the hearing the Head of Department will confirm the outcome of the hearing normally within 5 working days of the hearing.

Should it be confirmed that the academic member of staff's employment will be terminated, the individual will receive notice of termination in line with their contract of employment. The School normally extends the staff member's end date of their existing contract by one year in order to allow the staff member time to find alternative employment. The staff member will also be advised of the right of appeal.

Right of Appeal

The procedure to be used by the academic member of staff is the appeals procedure contained in the School's Academic Annex. This would be the final internal stage in the process.

9.5 Emergency Procedures for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor / Promotion to Professor

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 review and promotion round.

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

Procedure (1) Emergency Proposals which arise in session

Procedure (1) is designed to deal with emergency requests for Major Review and/or Promotion which arise during the session outside the normal annual cycle (and including normally, the Winter and Spring vacations). Procedure (1) is identical (except in timing) to the procedures used for the main Review and 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 VPFD 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 Review and Promotions exercise.

As with Procedure (1), the VPFD 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 Major Review and/or 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, teaching and contributions to the Department and the School
- A CV presented on the standard template including statements from the candidate on their contributions to education, their research achievement record and their planned research, and their contributions to citizenship.

The Promotions Committee will seek opinions from **two** external Referees, 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 4.7**), criteria for selection of Referees (**Section 8.2**), and writings (**Section 7**).

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, the Criteria for Major Review and promotion to Professor, can be found at **Section 3**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the Human Resources website.

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 VPFD, the VCAC, and the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education).

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

- Head of Department's Statement G/1.
- Candidate's CV (including contributions to education statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and contributions to citizenship statement) G/2.
- School student survey results.
- Reports of two external Referees 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. If 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 of external academic colleagues to act on short notice.

In exceptional circumstances, the VPFD, 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.

10 DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

10.1 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 VPFD or by the VCAC.

If the Promotions Committee's decision is that the Assistant Professor has not passed Interim Review, the Assistant Professor will be informed of this view in writing with an outline summary of reasons by the Chair of the Promotions Committee as soon as possible after the meeting.

For further information please see **Section 9.4 – Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review**.

If the Assistant Professor concerned passes Major Review, they will be promoted to the career grade of Associate Professor, normally from the following 1 August. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for Associate Professors.

If the Promotions Committee's decision is that the Assistant Professor has not passed Major Review, the Assistant Professor will be informed of this view in writing with an outline summary of reasons by the Chair of the Promotions Committee as soon as possible after the Promotions Committee meeting, but in good time before a meeting is convened by the Head of Department.

For further information please see **Section 9.4 – Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review**.

Successful Promotion

If a promotion case for a post-Major Review Assistant Professor is successful, they will be promoted to the career grade of Associate Professor, normally from the following 1 August and will be issued with the role profile applicable for Associate Professors.

If an Associate Professor's case for promotion is successful, they will be promoted to the career grade of Professor, normally from the following 1 August and will be issued with the role profile applicable for Professors.

Unsuccessful Promotion Applications

Unsuccessful candidates for promotion 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 Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) in their capacity as Chair of the Promotions Committee or with the VCAC, to discuss their case. There is no right of appeal against decisions reached by the Promotions Committee on promotion to Professor cases, nor for promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Assistant Professors). 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 Review and Promotion candidates are reported to the

Appointments Committee.

10.2 Salary Determination

Interim Review
Staff passing Interim Review will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for post-Interim Review Assistant Professors on Step 44, or receive two additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August.

Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor in the Same Session
Staff passing Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor in the same session will normally have their salaries increased to minimum salary for Associate Professors on Step 48, or receive five additional increments, whichever is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August.

Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor
Staff passing Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Associate Professors on Step 48, or receive three additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August.

Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only)
Post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors promoted to Associate Professor will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Associate Professors on Step 48 or receive three additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August.

Promotion to Professor
Staff promoted to Professor will normally have their salaries increased to the minimum salary for Professors on Step 58 or receive four additional increments, whichever increase is greater. The salary increase will normally take effect from the following 1 August.

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, and members of the Education Career Track staff to Associate Professor (Education) and Professor (Education). The Promotions Committee is a Sub-Committee of the Appointments Committee and is chaired by the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development).

2. Membership

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

Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) (Chair)
Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee
Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)

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.

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. Furthermore, Committee members from the same department as a candidate under consideration are not permitted to participate in discussion of the case, except to provide factual clarification if called upon by the Chair. In the case of a self-sponsored promotion proposal, Committee members from the same department as the candidate will be requested to leave the room while the case is considered.

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. 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 and Promotions as well as proposals put forward under the annual promotion round for research staff promotions to Associate Professorial Research Fellow, Professorial Research Fellow, and for Education Career Track staff to Associate Professor (Education) and Professor (Education), 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 (CDR) 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 Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (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 Spring 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 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 Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) chairs meetings of the Committee under delegated authority from the Director. In case they recuse themself, the Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education) takes over as Chair. In case, they recuse themself 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 they chair in lieu of the Chair in which case they have the casting vote.

Appointments Committee
June 2023

Annex B

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: 2025-2026

Ex Officio	Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Faculty Development) (Chair) Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education)	Professor Alex Voorhoeve Professor Pauline Barrieu Professor Emma McCoy
GROUP 1	Accounting Finance Management	Professor Diane Reyniers[2] Professor Kathy Yuan[1]
GROUP 2	European Institute Government International Development International Relations	Professor Toby Dodge[2] Professor Kate Meagher[1] TBC
GROUP 3	Economics Mathematics Methodology Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method Statistics	Professor Julia Boettcher[1] Professor Alan Manning[3] Professor Jouni Kuha[3]
GROUP 4	Anthropology Gender Studies Media and Communications Health Policy Psychological and Behavioural Science Social Policy Sociology	Professor Adam Oliver[1] Professor Mathijs Pelkmans[2] Professor Fran Tonkiss[1]
GROUP 5	Economic History Geography and Environment International History Law	Professor Olmo Silva[1] Professor Kristina Spohr[2] Professor Emmanuel Voyiakis[3] Professor Lea Ypi[2]

[1]Serving first year of a two-year term, 2025-27
[2]Serving second year of a two-year term, 2024-26
[3] Serving third year of a three-year term, 2023-26

Last updated 27 June 2025

PROMOTION AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC STAFF: TIMETABLE FOR 2025-2026

Documentation, including writings in electronic form, should be submitted electronically to hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk. **Failure to submit documents by the stated deadline may preclude consideration of the case.**

Autumn Term:	**Monday 29 September – Friday 12 December 2025**
Mon 29 September 2025	**Heads of Department's Deadline 1 (see Annex D for details)**
Mon 20 October 2025	**Heads of Department's Deadline 2 (see Annex D for details)**
Wed 12 November 2025	Promotions Committee (Schedule of Business) ▪ Receives names of Review and Promotion candidates and approves Referees to be consulted forthwith. ▪ Receives Journal List and Publishing Norms documents submitted by departments. ▪ Considers proposals for advancement / deferral of Interim Review / Major Review. ▪ Appoints Internal Readers and Monitors to read the writings of candidates for all cases
Winter Term:	**Monday 19 January – Thursday 2 April 2026**
Wed 4 February 2026	Promotions Committee (Interim Reviews) ▪ Takes decisions on **Interim Reviews** of Assistant Professors ▪ Takes decisions on proposals for **Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow**
Tue 3 March, Wed 4 March, Thu 5 March & Wed 25 March 2026	Promotions Committee (Major Review and Promotion cases) ▪ Takes decisions on 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** ▪ Takes decisions on promotions of **research staff** ▪ Takes decisions on promotions of **Education Career Track staff** **HEADS OF DEPARTMENT** are asked to ensure they are present in the School and available to attend this meeting, if called.
Spring Term:	**Tuesday 5 May – Friday 19 June 2026**
Wed 13 May 2026	Promotions Committee (Annual Review) ▪ 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 10 June 2026	Appointments Committee (VCAC's Annual Report) ▪ 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 29 September 2025)	HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 20 October 2025)
Department Documentation	• A Departmental Journal List and Publishing Norms Document (for note by PC)	• Nothing required
Interim Review	• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	• Head of Department's Statement G/1 • Electronic copies of 2 writings* • Candidate's Statement (for cases without departmental support) G/7**
Deferred Interim Review* **	• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/5 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	• Nothing required
Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor	• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Referees for Major Reviews G/3 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	• Head of Department's Statement G/1 • Departmental Teaching Observation G/4** • Candidate's Statement (for cases without departmental support) G/7** • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Deferred Major Review* **	• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/5 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	• Nothing required
Promotion	• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Referees for Promotion G/3 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	• Head of Department's Statement G/1 • Departmental Teaching Observation G/4** • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*

<table>
<tr><td>Self-sponsored Promotion (for candidates submitting their own documents, the HoD deadline applies)</td><td>• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2
• Referees for Promotion G/3
• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6</td><td>• Head of Department's Statement G/1
• Departmental Teaching Observation G/4**
• Candidate’s Statement G/7
• Electronic copies of 4 writings*
• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Emergency Major Review or Promotion</td><td colspan="2">Until Human Resources receives the following, the process cannot commence:
• Head of Department Statement G/1
• CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2
• Referees for Promotion G/3
• Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">These documents must follow as soon as possible:
• Electronic copies of 4 writings*
• Electronic copies of any book reviews*</td></tr>
</table>

* If electronic copies are unavailable then 7 hard copies of each item are required.
** Optional
*** For deferrals from the 2025-26 academic session, documentation should be submitted as soon as possible and by no later than HoD Deadline 1. For deferrals from the 2026-27 academic session, documentation should be submitted by Monday 23 March 2026, in order for the Promotions Committee to be able to consider the request at its meeting to be held on 13 May 2026.

Annex E

REFERENCE GUIDE TO PEER REVIEWERS (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)

All Referee nominations on Referees form G/3 should be submitted by **HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 29 September 2025).** All documentation must be sent electronically to hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

The Criteria for Selection of External Referees (**Section 8.2**) must be followed when making recommendations, any queries must be directed as soon as possible to the VCAC in the first instance.

	Interim Review	**Major Review, Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor**	**Self-Sponsored Promotion**	**Emergency Major Review or Promotion**
2 x External Referee (for cases without departmental support)	VCAC	-	-	-
2 x External Referee (for cases without departmental support)	Cand	-	-	-
4 x External Referee	-	Dept	VCAC	Dept
4 x External Referee	-	Cand	Cand	-
Internal Reader	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC
Monitor	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC
Eden Centre reports	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre

Annex F

RECIPIENTS OF DOCUMENTATION WITHIN THE ACADEMIC REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS

	Head of Department's Statement G/1	CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2	Departmental Teaching Observation G/4 (optional) and Eden Centre Teaching Observation (if requested)	Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/5	Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/6	Candidate's Statement (For Candidates Considered for Promotion without Departmental Support) G/7	Submitted Writings	Book Reviews	TQARO Student Survey Results	Referee Reports
Referees		x					x			
Promotions Committee (inc. Chair and Vice President and Pro-Vice Chancellor (Education), Education)	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x
VCAC	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x