

GUIDELINES FOR INTERIM REVIEW AND MAJOR REVIEW OF LECTURERS 2018-19

Contents

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

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

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

Terry Hosten, HR Manager, Review and Promotions
(Secretary to the Appointments Committee)
Human Resources Division, LRB 5th Floor
Email: hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk
Tel: 020 7107 5242



INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES	1
1.1 Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)	1
1.2 Introduction to Interim Review and Major Review	1
1.3 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances	2
1.4 Part-Time Staff	3
1.5 Interviews	3
1.6 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission	3
1.7 Department of Management	3
1.8 GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of the Review Process	4
1.9 Academic Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring	4
1.10 General	5
2. TIMING OF REVIEW IN THE ACADEMIC SESSION	6
2.1 Timing of Interim Review	6
2.2 Timing of Major Review	6
2.3 Interim Review and Major Review in the Same Session	6
2.4 Advancement or Deferral of Interim or Major Review	6
2.5 Automatic Interruption and Stopping of Review 'Clock'	8
3. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW	9
3.1 Aim of Interim Review	9
3.2 Criteria for Interim Review	9
3.3 Failure at Interim Review	10
3.4 Aim of Major Review	10
3.5 Criteria for Major Review	10
3.6 Failure at Major Review	11
4. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE REVIEW PROCESS	12
4.1 Functions of the Head of Department	12
4.2 Administrative workload pre-Major Review	12
4.3 Research Student Supervision	12
4.4 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee	12
4.5 Departmental Support for Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate	13
4.6 Head of Department's Role in Major Review	13
4.7 Head of Department's Statement	14
4.8 Content of the Head of Department's Statement for Major Review	14
5. TEACHING	16
5.1 Self-evaluative commentary on teaching contribution	17
5.2 Teaching Observations	17
5.3 LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education	17
5.4 Teaching Prizes	18
6. CANDIDATE'S SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE.....	19
6.1 Work cited on the CV	19
6.2 Work cited on the CV for Interim Review	19
6.3 Work submitted for Major Review	19
7. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW.....	21
7.1 Role of External Referees in the Review Process	21
7.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees	21
7.3 Confidentiality	22
8. PROCEDURES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS.....	23
8.1 Procedure for Interim Review or Major Review	23
8.2 Consideration of Major Reviews	25
9. DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE.....	26
9.1 Notification of Decisions	26
9.2 Salary Determination	26

Annexes

Annex A: Promotions Committee: Terms of Reference and Membership

Annex B: Membership of the Promotions Committee 2018-19

Annex C: Timetable for Promotion and Review of Academic Staff 2018-19

Annex D: Reference Guide to Deadlines for Review Documentation

Annex E: Reference Guide to Peer Reviewers (External & Internal)

Annex F: Form Template Samples

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES

This guidance refers to Lecturers who have chosen not to opt in to the [New Academic Career Structure](#).

There is no longer a promotion route beyond Lecturer grade under this structure. Post-Major Review Lecturers are referred to Section 1.5 of the Guidelines for Review and Promotion of Assistant and Associate Professor for information on promotion to Associate Professor, available on the [Human Resources website](#).

An electronic copy of this guidance, along with copies of the required forms, can be found at the [Human Resources website](#).

Decisions about success at Interim Review or Major Review are made solely on merit, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, teaching, and the contribution he/she is making to the work of the Department and the School. Review 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 as well as being available on the [Human Resources website](#).

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

If any member of staff has concerns about the review process, whether at School or Department level, he or she is 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 Charles Stafford is the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC). The VCAC may be contacted at C.Stafford@lse.ac.uk for advice on specific cases throughout the session. The VCAC works closely with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), Professor Eric Neumayer.

1.2 Introduction to Interim Review and Major Review

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 Lecturers and the School.

A review process operates for Lecturers in the School which is divided into two stages: Interim Review and Major Review. The purpose of these two review processes is to provide the opportunity for detailed and careful consideration of progress against the agreed criteria.

A Lecturer who has been appointed post-Interim Review will only be subject to Major Review. Those who have been appointed as Lecturers on an open-ended contract are referred to **Section 1.3** of the Guidelines for Review and Promotion of Assistant and Associate Professor for information on promotion to Associate Professor, available on the [Human Resources website](#). **Decisions about success at Interim Review and Major Review are made solely on merit**, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, teaching, and the contribution he/she is making to the general life of the Department and the School.

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

1.3 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances

The School expects that if staff members' individual circumstances are affecting their day-to-day activities or performance the individual would have raised these at the earliest opportunity with their Department 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/8* as these can be resolved through local discussion. For advice please consult the relevant HR Partner in the first instance.

If the circumstances are exceptional then the Promotions Committee will, where necessary, consider the effect of a candidate's individual circumstances on their career progression where information has been provided by the candidate and, where the candidate so wishes, 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 [Equalities 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 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 2.5 Automatic Interruption and Stopping of the Review 'Clock'**.

The *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/8* 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 severity of the circumstances. The details of the circumstances will not be disclosed to the Promotions Committee.

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

In cases where the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/8* has been submitted, the VCAC and Human Resources may begin gathering further information on the background of the case. Human Resources may, if the candidate has informed the Head of Department of the individual circumstances, then request a more detailed statement from the Head of Department to aid advice to the VCAC (this information **will not** be shared with the Promotions Committee), and may include information such as the following:

- A description of the situation
- The effect it has had on the candidate's ability to carry out their duties

- Details of any Doctors notes, OH referral recommendations etc. (where applicable)
- Action taken by Department, including any reasonable adjustments made to the candidate's role in the Department, flexible working arrangements, mentoring, Departmental commitments including administration
- The effectiveness of those adjustments in increasing the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Career advice given in 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 **Annex C** for the deadline of submission of the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/8*.

1.4 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 or Major Review. However, the Committee accepts that the quantity across the range of academic activities will be commensurate with the part-time appointment. The VCAC may be contacted for advice on specific cases.

1.5 Interviews

Consideration of Interim Review and Major Review 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 to attend – if, for example, there is a need for factual clarification in a particular case. Wherever possible, Heads of Department should be in the School and available on the dates the Promotions Committee meets (in the Lent term) to consider Major Reviews (dates of this session's meetings are available at **Annex C** of these Guidelines and on the [Human Resources website](#)).

1.6 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission

The current session deadlines for submission of documentation to Human Resources are set out in the 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 no later than the specified dates.

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

1.7 Department of Management

The Department of Management was originally organised on a federal basis around a number of different disciplines and subject Groups, but these Groups have since been discontinued. All proposals for Interim and Major Review will therefore be considered as originating from the Department of Management, through the Head of Department, and not

from any subject groupings or research and teaching clusters that may exist within the Department.

1.8 GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of 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, legal proceedings or a valid subject access request under the provisions of the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018 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).

1.9 Academic Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring

The Promotions Committee expects that all academics, and particularly those coming up for Interim Review or Major Review, will receive constructive advice on career development from senior academic colleagues. 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, and in that context, to flag at an early stage any issues of concern to the Promotions Committee. The Scheme is designed to facilitate proactive support, mentoring and career guidance for staff throughout their academic careers.

Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that the *Academic Career Development Review Scheme* is operating effectively at departmental level, and in particular for ensuring that Academic Career Development Review Meetings (ACDR Meetings) for Academic Staff pre-Major Review take place on an annual basis. They are also responsible for ensuring the ACDR forms are submitted to Human Resources for the VCAC's review.

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

Mentoring

For pre-Major Review Lecturers, the role of the Mentor is considered to be of importance in supporting career development. Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that pre-Major Review Lecturers are assigned a departmental Mentor, and for reporting this information to the first meeting of the Promotions Committee every session. The Mentoring Scheme is **distinct** from the Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme. Mentors give informal and frequent advice and provide a listening ear throughout the year, whereas formal Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) meetings take place annually and are normally conducted by the Head of Department. Importantly, the mentor cannot be the one holding the Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) meeting. Between them, the pre-Major Review Lecturer's Mentor and the Head of Department share responsibility for supporting the Lecturer towards his/her Interim Review and Major Review. Lecturers 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](#).

Mentors and Heads of Department are also encouraged to contact TLC for customised, individual advice / training.

1.10 General

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

2. TIMING OF INTERIM REVIEW AND MAJOR REVIEW

2.1 Timing of Interim Review

Interim Reviews usually take place in the third year of appointment. There is scope for the Interim Review to be held either earlier or later than this if circumstances warrant the advancement or deferral of Interim Review with a maximum deferral until the sixth year of appointment. Further information about the procedures to follow for advancement or deferral of Interim Review is provided in **Section 2.4** below.

Certain events also result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the clock) – see **Section 2.5** below.

2.2 Timing of Major Review

For Lecturers appointed subject to Interim Review and Major Review, Major Review will normally take place in the **fifth year** of appointment. For Lecturers appointed subject to Major Review only, Major Review will normally take place in the third year of appointment. Heads of Department should note that there is scope for the Major Review to be held either earlier or later than this if circumstances warrant the advancement or deferral of Major Review. The maximum deferral for those appointed subject to Interim Review and Major Review is to the eighth year of appointment, and for those appointed subject to Major Review only, to the sixth year of appointment. Further information about the procedures to follow for advancement or deferral of Major Review is provided in **Section 2.4** below.

Certain events also result in an automatic interruption (stopping of the clock) – see **Section 2.5** below.

2.3 Interim Review and Major Review in the Same Session

The Promotions Committee is prepared to consider requests from Heads of Department for a Lecturer to undergo Interim Review and Major Review in the same academic session.

The two are separate processes. Candidates must pass Interim Review before they can be considered for Major Review. If it is necessary for the Head of Department to make a request to advance the Interim and/or Major Review, then the usual procedures for advancement should be followed (see **Section 2.4** below).

2.4 Advancement or Deferral of Interim or Major Review

The Promotions Committee is prepared to consider requests for the advancement or deferral of Interim Review or Major Review. If a Lecturer considers that he/she may wish to have their Interim Review or Major Review held earlier or later than the original timescale (see **Section 2.1** and **2.2** above), he/she should discuss the reason(s) with his/her Head of Department.

Should the request for advancement or deferral of Interim Review be approved, the candidate's timetable to Major Review will automatically be adjusted to two years post the new Interim Review date. From the 2012-13 academic session, requests for advancement or deferral of Interim Review or Major Review are considered by the VCAC and the Pro-Director, Faculty Development in the first instance, with only cases that are complex or raise a matter of principle being put to the full Promotions Committee at its first meeting of the session. The Promotions Committee may revisit the decisions of the VCAC and Pro-Director, Faculty Development if it feels it is necessary.

Advancement

The Head of Department will consult the Lecturer's Mentor and the Professors within the Department for their views on whether the Lecturer's progress is such that he/she is ready to go forward for Interim Review or Major Review. If, after appropriate consultation(s), the Head of Department considers that the Lecturer's progress is such that he/she may undergo Interim Review or Major Review earlier than originally anticipated, the Head of Department should request that the relevant Review be advanced. The reasons for the request should be set out by the Head of Department on the *Request for Advancement or Deferral of Interim Review and/or Major Review Form G/10* and submitted together with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Requests for advancement of Interim Review or Major Review will normally be submitted in the academic session in which it is proposed that the advanced review should take place.

Deferral

The Promotions Committee is willing to consider deferral of Interim Review or Major Review for either one or two years in appropriate cases. The total of such deferrals (excluding parental leave and periods of incapacity due to severe illness) should not exceed three years. The following are examples of circumstances in which deferral may be agreed:

- Family related absence
- Personal circumstances which have disrupted normal duties
- 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).

There is no presumption that a Lecturer will necessarily wish to request deferral if these or other such circumstances arise. For example, where a Lecturer takes up a part-time appointment, the Head of Department's recommendation and decision of the Promotions Committee will have due regard to the Lecturer's hours of work (see **Section 1.4**).

A request for deferral is for the Lecturer to decide in the first instance, in consultation with his/her Head of Department. The Head of Department will consult with Lecturer's Mentor and the Professors within the department. A request for deferral and the decision will not reflect unfavourably on a Lecturer'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.

Deferral of Interim or Major Review may also come about in the circumstances set out above where the Promotions Committee considers that either the School or the Lecturer, or both, would benefit from the Promotions Committee having the opportunity to consider the Lecturer's position again. The Promotions Committee may ask the VCAC to maintain a watching brief on progress.

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/7* and submitted with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Deferral requests 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.

2.5 Automatic Interruption and Stopping of Review ‘Clock’

Parental leave (maternity/paternity/adoption/shared parental leave) constitutes an automatic interruption (stopping of the clock) to a Lecturer’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 at the earliest opportunity.

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 parental (maternity/ paternity/ adoption/ shared parental) leave, 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 parental 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 parental 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 or advancement of Interim or Major Review on other grounds in a subsequent year, should that be considered necessary.

3. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW

3.1 Aim of Interim Review

The aim of the Interim Review, normally held in the **third** year after appointment, is to assess the Lecturer's progress during the early part of his/her appointment; to confirm whether he/she is making good progress in a direction that will lead to a successful Major Review, and to ensure that he/she is receiving appropriate career development support from the Department.

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

3.2 Criteria for Interim Review

In considering Interim Reviews the Promotions Committee evaluates the candidate's activities across research and publication, teaching and contributions to the Department and the School.

Criteria for Interim Review

- Evidence of an emerging research programme with, at minimum, work submitted for publication in high quality outlets
- Evidence of effective teaching
- Evidence of constructive contributions to the life of the department, the work of the School and where appropriate, School Research Centres.

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 teaching contribution and performance, and (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
- 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 operation of the CDR process
- A statement from the candidate on their teaching contribution and related activities
- School student teaching survey results

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

3.3 Failure at Interim Review

Should a Lecturer fail to pass Interim Review, the Lecturer will be informed of this decision in writing with an outline summary of reasons as soon as possible after the meeting. The Lecturer will be advised that he/she has a right, if he/she wishes, to appeal against the decision of the Promotions Committee. Further information about the appeal process is available on request from Human Resources. The School will normally extend the staff member's end date of his or her existing contract by one year in order to allow the staff member time to find alternative employment.

3.4 Aim of Major Review

The Promotions Committee conducts a Major Review when the Lecturer is to be considered for appointment to an open-ended contract. The procedure is designed to evaluate the extent of the Lecturer's success and promise in research and scholarship, his/her academic merit and professional standing generally, the extent of his/her commitment and success in teaching, and the extent to which he/she has made a contribution to the work of the Department and the School. It is not a competitive exercise. Under Promotions Committee procedures, there is no self-sponsored route for Major Review.

3.5 Criteria for Major Review

For those who passed the Interim Review in the third year of employment, the Promotions Committee will normally expect significant further progress since the time of Interim Review – for example, an upward trajectory in terms of research and publications, continued high quality teaching and pedagogical innovation, and evidence of collegiality and service to the School.

In cases where Interim and Major Review are coterminous or where Interim Review was waived at appointment, the Promotions Committee will focus on performance in research, teaching and departmental administration since appointment.

Criteria for Major Review

- Evidence of a sustained research programme and peer-reviewed publications of good quality
- Evidence of a coherent and feasible three to five year plan of future research and publications
- Evidence of quality teaching at undergraduate and postgraduate levels
- Evidence of constructive contributions to departmental administration and School service
- A developing reputation in the subject
- Where appropriate, securing external funds to support research and contributions to School Research Centres.

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

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their teaching contribution and related activities, a research achievement record and a statement of planned research
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department including comments on teaching observation 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 CDR process
- TLC Teaching Observation Report
- 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 work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- 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 in the promotions process but it will not be a determining factor in promotion. The Promotions Committee will be made aware that citation records can suffer from gender and other biases. Candidates are *permitted* to provide their citation count and encouraged to put this into context. Where candidates provide their citation count, Heads of Department are expected to comment on the citation count and its context (e.g., average citation counts in a field of study, the candidate's academic age).

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

3.6 Failure at Major Review

Should a Lecturer fail to pass Major Review, the Lecturer will be informed of this decision in writing with an outline summary of reasons as soon as possible after the meeting. The Lecturer will be advised that he/she has a right, if he/she wishes, to appeal against the decision of the Promotions Committee. Further information about the appeal process is available on request from Human Resources. The School will normally extend the staff member's end date of his or her existing contract by one year in order to allow the staff member time to find alternative employment.

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

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 academic staff, and particularly those coming up for Interim and Major Review, receive constructive advice on career development, and that the *Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme* (available on the [Human Resources website](#)) operates effectively at department level, including the nomination of senior members of Academic Staff to conduct CDR meetings, where not undertaken by the Head of Department, and ensuring that CDR Meetings are conducted where appropriate.
- To ensure that Lecturers receive appropriate career development advice and support from senior members of Academic Staff;
- To appoint Departmental Mentors for pre-Major Review Lecturers;
- To keep under review with departmental Professorial colleagues the progress of Lecturers towards Interim Review and Major Review and to be responsible for the submission of proposals for Interim Review and Major Review to the Promotions Committee;

There is an annual timetable governing submission of proposals for Interim Review and Major Review in **Annex C** to these Guidelines. All proposals are assessed by the Promotions Committee.

A reference guide to the Review deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**. The Criteria for Interim Review and Major Review can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 8 Procedures**. Template forms are at **Annex F** and, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the Human Resources website.

4.2 Administrative workload pre-Major Review

Heads of Department are reminded of the Promotions Committee's expectation that, normally, pre-Major Review Lecturers should not be asked to carry heavy administrative workloads.

4.3 Research Student Supervision

Heads of Department are reminded that the School's *Regulations for Research Degrees* states that the departmental Doctoral Programme Director has responsibility for ensuring that members of staff pre-Major Review do not have sole 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 3.2** and **3.5** concerning review proposals to the Promotions Committee via Human Resources, except the TLC Teaching Report for Major Review. It follows that Heads of Department are expected to take an active role in advising candidates on presentation of their CVs on the *CV Template G/2*, ensuring that information is set out clearly and that there are no omissions. Heads of Department are also expected to sign off on these forms.

Documentation submitted directly to Human Resources by candidates will not be accepted.

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, the Criteria for Interim and Major Review can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 8 Procedures**. Template forms are at **Annex F** and, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the Human Resources website.

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

4.5 Departmental Support for Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate

The Head of Department must have consulted professorial colleagues regarding the candidate, and the Head of Department's Statement should be based on the information submitted to and considered by the department's Professoriate. The *Head of Department's Statement G/1* should make clear which members of the department's Professoriate (e.g. Professors on leave) were involved in the discussion leading to the decision to recommend the Major Review of the candidate. The Committee expects that a decision will be taken on the basis of a vote by all serving Professors, and that the *Head of Department's Statement G/1* will indicate the numbers voting for and against as well as those abstaining. A candidate cannot normally be put forward for advanced Major Review in accordance with **Section 2.4** unless he/she has majority support of those voting. The Promotions Committee does not regard unanimity of the departmental Professoriate as a *sine qua non* of a successful case, but does expect that if there are differing opinions these will be explained in full in the *Head of Department's Statement G/1*.

Departments may solicit external references to inform their decision on whether to support a candidate for Major Review. 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 7.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees.
- Candidates should be invited to nominate up to 50 per cent of the referees.
- The soliciting letter/email needs to be approved by the VCAC. To maximise the usefulness of references, referees should be sent the writings that would be submitted to the School's Promotions Committee and ask referees to comment in detail on the quality of these writings.
- All soliciting emails should be copied to Human Resources and all references received must be made available to the VCAC and Human Resources.
- Where the case does not receive Departmental support, the VCAC will check that the candidate has been treated fairly.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, all reference letters solicited by the Department will be made available to the Promotions Committee.
- Where the case comes to the Promotions Committee for decision, the VCAC has the right to allow the reference letters solicited by the Department to substitute for some or all of the reference letters that would otherwise be solicited by the Promotions Committee.

4.6 Head of Department's Role in Major Review

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 is not a competitive exercise but an assessment of whether an individual meets the standards set by the School for appointment to an open-ended contract.

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

Interim Review

The Head of Department's statement 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. The statement should also confirm that annual CDR meetings have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate.

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

Major Review

The Promotions Committee views the Major Review as one of the most important decisions for the School. The evidence in the Head of Department's statement is of particular weight. The Promotions Committee would expect that should the Head of Department have any serious concerns regarding the Lecturer's prospects for a successful Major Review, the Head of Department would have sought the advice of the VCAC and HR Partner at a much earlier stage.

4.8 Content of the Head of Department's Statement for Major Review

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 and Publication:

The Head of Department should indicate his/her opinion of the quality of the candidate's research, published outputs, and future trajectory - including, where appropriate, the candidate's success in publishing in the top journals and 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 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 a PhD is *sine qua non*
- 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 submitted Departmental Journal Lists to inform its decision-making and evaluation of candidates.

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 teaching survey, and feedback from colleagues in the Centre for Learning Technology and Teaching and Learning 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 teaching 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 teaching contribution 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 Head of Department must also ensure that a Departmental teaching observation takes place and submit the report on this observation on form G/6.

4. Service to the Department and the School:

The Head of Department should provide his/her 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 CDR meetings) have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and the Department's expectations for future career progression. Under the School's *Academic Staff Career Development and Review (CDR) Scheme* (available on the [Human Resources website](#)), pre-Major Review Lecturers will have an annual CDR meeting).

5 TEACHING

5.1 Self-evaluative commentary on teaching contribution

Candidates should keep in mind that the Promotions Committee puts much emphasis on a detailed and self-evaluative teaching contribution commentary by candidates and supporting evidence as part of the *CV Template G/2*. An evaluative commentary on their teaching contribution and performance is expected from all candidates. The relevant section of the CV template should be between 2,000 and 2,200 words; additional evidence can be placed in an appendix. The commentary is attached to the CV as a separate teaching contribution statement.

Candidates should present a case for how they fulfil the criteria for the relevant review they are considered for. The criteria potentially relating to teaching contribution and performance are as follows:

Interim Review

- Evidence of effective teaching

Major Review

- Evidence of quality teaching at undergraduate and postgraduate levels

In order to address the criteria directly, candidates may 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 who are further along in their career and therefore not relevant to Lecturers):

- Their approach to teaching, learning and assessment
- Evidence of engagement with student diversity and discussion of notable successes and/or challenges in terms of teaching
- Evidence of use of Moodle or other e-learning tools and other approaches that address diversity in teaching delivery
- Diversity of teaching and learning approaches used by the individual and extent to which they introduce new ideas
- Use of teaching development funding from TLC/LTI/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 role – e.g. in course, programme, examinations, student selection, tutoring, work with GTAs, colleague mentoring, external programmes, committee contributions
- Feedback from GTAs/others working with the individual
- Evidence of LSE teaching prizes (e.g., Major Review teaching prize, SU nomination; department and disciplinary awards) or non-LSE teaching-related prizes/commendations
- External grant funding for teaching development – with evidence of outcomes arising
- Conference presentations/journal articles related to pedagogy
- Lead author/editor of textbook
- Evidence of engagement in personal/professional development in relation to teaching
- Evidence of 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

Candidates are advised to refer to a range of evidence to substantiate the claims made in the commentary. Candidates are invited to add to their self-evaluative teaching contribution

commentary an appendix with additional documents to substantiate claims made in the commentary. The appendix is intended to be concise, and the Promotions Committee's expectation is that items will be immediately relevant and brief, such as an enhanced course guide. Candidates should note that the Promotions Committee already has access to TQARO student survey results and Departmental and Teaching and Learning Centre observation reports.

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 should be conducted for all review candidates. The *Departmental Teaching Observation Form G/6* form should contain an evaluative commentary of the candidate's teaching as observed by the Head of Department or his/her delegate.

It is assumed that Heads of Department will have planned for departmental teaching observations to be carried out for members of staff scheduled for Review in the current session. The Promotions Committee does however recognise that there will be some cases where it may not be possible for a teaching observation to be carried out by the relevant deadline for submission, such as when a member of staff is on leave or in the case of advancement of Interim and/or Major Review. Such cases are to be regarded as exceptional and Heads of Department will be expected to account for the reason(s) for the absence of reference to the teaching observation in their statements on candidates and set out the proposed arrangements for carrying out an observation at the earliest opportunity. The Promotions Committee will reserve the right to defer a decision pending receipt of a satisfactory teaching observation.

In all cases, 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.

5.3 LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education

All new career-track Lecturers 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 in the UK are expected to undertake and complete the associate level of the LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCertHE).

All new career-track Lecturers appointed from the 2011-12 session to the 2012-13 session with less than three years' teaching experience and who have not completed and passed an equivalent programme elsewhere in the UK are expected to undertake, complete and *pass* the associate level of the LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education (PGCertHE) *prior* to being considered for *Major Review*.

For all further information, see the School's [Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education website](#).

5.4 Teaching Prizes

The School operates a scheme for annual award of Teaching Prizes to successful candidates who have shown exceptional flair and effectiveness as teachers at two points in their academic career: at Major Review and at the point of promotion to Professor. Eligibility for consideration under the Teaching Prize Scheme is normally by recommendation from the candidate's Head of Department. Prizes normally take the form of a £5,000 one off non-pensionable/non-consolidated payment. Normally, a maximum of **five** prizes will be allocated per academic year to staff undergoing Major Review.

The key criteria considered for teaching prizes for Major Review candidates are:

- Excellent teaching which has a positive impact on student learning
- Demonstration of the ability to work effectively with diverse student groups (e.g. diversity in year/level/ability/disciplinary and cultural background of students and diversity in mode of teaching)
- Contribution to innovations in curriculum and/or delivery approach of departmental educational provision
- Proactive leadership/development at course level, including own professional development and some evidence of developing others (e.g. GTAs)

Guidance to Heads of Departments:

Heads of Department wishing to put forward a member of staff for a Teaching Prize should do so in the *Head of Department Statement G/1*. Heads should address how the candidates fulfil and excel at the criteria outlined above. In addition, Heads of Department are **required** to address the following in the nomination:

- Volume of teaching and teaching related activity in relation to colleagues within the department
- The level of difficulty of subject matter being taught
- Whether feedback on teaching performance is positive
- How the candidate deals with feedback. If problems have been identified how these have been dealt with
- Any other matters that may need explanation/interpretation in the School student teaching survey results

If the Department has more than one candidate at each level, the Head of Department should indicate those aspects which differentiate performance and rank the proposed candidates.

Guidance to Candidates:

Individuals wishing to be nominated by their Head of Department for a Teaching Prize are strongly advised to seek the advice of the TLC Director on the presentation of their case, alongside discussing their case with their Head of Department.

Candidates should keep in mind that the Teaching Prize Group puts much emphasis on a detailed and self-evaluative teaching contribution commentary by candidates and supporting evidence on the *CV Template G/2*. Guidelines for writing this commentary are in section 5.1.

Nominations will be considered by the Teaching Prize Group comprising:

- Pro Director, Teaching and Learning
- Director, Teaching and Learning Centre
- Director, Learning Technology and Innovation
- Pro-Director, Faculty Development
- Vice Chair of Appointments Committee

The Promotions Committee may nominate additional members in order to ensure gender equity on the Teaching Prize Group. The Teaching Prize Group proposes the award of Teaching Prizes to the Promotions Committee, which is formally responsible for their conferment.

6. CANDIDATE'S SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE

6.1 Work cited on the CV

Candidates should, note that the Promotions Committee reserves the right to request copies of any work cited on the *CV Template G/2*. It follows that work should be available in physical form and preferably electronic form as well in case the Promotions Committee should request it.

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

6.2 Work cited on the CV for Interim Review

There is no requirement for the submission of writings in support of Interim Review.

6.3 Work submitted for Major Review

The Promotions Committee will consider the quality of writings of Major Review candidates. The candidate should normally submit to Human Resources **four** writings which he/she believes best represent his/her qualities as a scholar.

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

Stage of Publication

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

All candidates are asked to state clearly on the CV the stage all their publications 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 in all cases – i.e. for all work on the CV not just the submitted pieces. For all publications on the CV in revise and resubmit status, candidates are required to submit the editors' confirmation email inviting the candidate to revise and resubmit the piece. Any reviews, whether favourable or not, which have appeared on any the candidate's books, whether submitted as part of the writings or not, should also be submitted.

Co-authorship

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

The Promotions Committee recognises that co-authorship is the norm for some disciplines and where this is the case, jointly authored work will be considered of equal standing. Candidates are required to provide a numerical indication in percentage terms of their contribution(s) to joint work on the CV, alongside the requirement to state the respective contributions of co-authors in regard to the initiation, conduct and direction of the work. Candidates should also provide details of the proportion of intellectual contribution made to the work (e.g. indicating their involvement in the formulation of key themes, concepts and theories). The statement should not exceed 200 words. **The Promotions Committee**

reserves the right to ask co-authors for a confirmation of the respective contributions stated by promotion candidates.

Multiple book chapters of the same book

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

Publication language

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

In cases where a publication(s) submitted for Major Review 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

Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that:

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

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

7. EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

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

It is the responsibility of the Head of Department to ensure that, prior to nomination; all external reviewers (Referees) are willing to be contacted by the VCAC and to participate in the process.

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

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

7.1 Role of External Referees in the Review 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. 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 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

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of **five** external referees (including one reserve) for each candidate for Major Review on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/4*. The Promotions Committee will seek references from at least four of the five 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 Departments, and may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the Department. The Promotions Committee gives its referees the option to provide comparisons to academics from the same cohort in the candidate's field.

Referees are asked to comment specifically on the candidate's planned research as set out in the research trajectory statement.

7.2 Criteria for Selection of External Referees

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

- All referees should be employed by a distinguished university.
- For each candidate, at least one referee should be employed by a top tier UK University and at least one should be employed by a distinguished overseas institution.
- Referees should be confined to those of full Professorial (or Emeritus Professorial) status or equivalent. Heads of Department should provide written justification in any case where a referee does not hold the title of Professor.

- The nomination of more than one referee from the same Department within the same institution will not normally be permitted.
- 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 with the candidate in the past four years. Heads of Department should seek the advice of the VCAC for disciplines where joint authorship is the norm and where collaborators 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.

7.3 Confidentiality

Referees are advised that any reference provided in connection with the Major Review 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 candidates or to Heads of Departments. However, in circumstances such as a Major Review appeal hearing, grievance, legal proceedings or a valid subject access request under the provisions of the GDPR and Data Protection Act 2018, references may have to be disclosed to a third party.

8. PROCEDURES OF THE REVIEW PROCESS

8.1 Procedure for Interim Review or Major Review

The core format of Interim Review and Major Review is that a recommendation from the Lecturer's Head of Department on whether the Lecturer should pass the relevant Review is made to the Promotions Committee, which then makes the decision on the basis of all the evidence in front of it.

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

1. *Notification from Human Resources*

Lecturers 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. Lecturers will be informed where the relevant documentation can be located on the Human Resources website.

Please note that candidates for Review will need to have their student teaching survey results from up to the four preceding academic sessions available. This teaching data can be helpful for candidates to comment on their scores on the relevant template form and Heads of Department to refer to candidates' teaching performance in their recommendations. The questionnaire results can be made available to the Head of Department by the Teaching Quality and Assurance Office (TQARO). A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**. For further information about Teaching Prizes see **Section 5.3**.

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

The Lecturer has the opportunity to submit to his/her Head of Department any information that he/she considers relevant, or to ask for a deferral of the Review if he/she so desires. The procedure for submitting information varies between Departments: the Head of Department will offer the opportunity of a discussion meeting with the Lecturer and/or the Lecturer will be given the opportunity to submit a written statement about his/her work which the Head of Department will use in preparation of his/her statement to the Promotions Committee. This discussion should include any relevant candidate's personal circumstances that either the Head of Department or the candidate feels the Promotions Committee should take into account, and an agreement 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/8*. For further information about individual circumstances see **Section 1.5**. The Head of Department should give the Lecturer 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 Lecturer 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 (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 Lecturer is not making the required level of progress towards Major Review and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit, as listed in **Section 2.1**, 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 Lecturer's progress and activities in research and publication, teaching, and service to the School. For those undergoing Interim Review, in addition to his/her 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. Where it considers it appropriate, the Promotions Committee may canvass the views of one or more such outside referees.

For Major Review candidates, if, after the consultations and consideration referred to above, the Head of Department cannot recommend that the Lecturer passes Major Review and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit for Major Review has been reached, as listed in **Section 2.2**, the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee setting out the reasons and reporting on the Lecturer'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 taken into account 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 Lecturer should pass his/her Interim and/or Major Review.

Interim Review

Heads of Department should note that the Promotions Committee is in no way bound to follow the recommendation of the Head of Department. It is a basic School principle that Review recommendations are subject to assessment and evaluation by Professors from other departments. It is open to the Promotions Committee either to endorse the recommendation, to reject it, or to defer the Lecturer's Interim Review subject to the maximum time limits as set out in **Section 2.1**. This latter step will be taken only where the Promotions Committee considers that either the School or the Lecturer, or both, would benefit from the Promotions Committee having the possibility to consider the Lecturer'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. Where it considers it appropriate, the Promotions Committee may canvass the views of one or more such outside referees.

Major Review

At the Major Review stage, the progress of a Lecturer will be considered in terms of the elements outlined in **Section 3.5** above. Major Review is not a competitive exercise but an assessment of whether an individual should be appointed to an open-ended contract. The Promotions Committee will consider the Lecturer's contribution in its entirety, taking into account progress made since he/she passed Interim Review. If the Lecturer was appointed subject to Major Review only the Promotions Committee will consider the Lecturer's progress since their appointment at the School.

8.2 Consideration of Major Reviews

Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees 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. The Promotions Committee is in no way bound to follow the recommendation of the Head of Department. It is a basic School principle that Departmental recommendations for Major Review are subject to assessment and evaluation by Professors from other departments. It is open to the Promotions Committee either to endorse the recommendation, to reject it, or to defer the decision subject to the maximum time limits as set out in **Section 2.2**.

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 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 **Section 3.5**. The Monitor does not read the candidate's submitted pieces as a matter of routine, although copies of writings are provided on request.

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

Deferral of cases to a later meeting

Where, in the view of the Internal Reader / Monitor / Committee, a case is deemed to be 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. THE DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

9.1 Notification of Decisions

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

Successful Interim Review

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a Lecturer fulfils the requirements for passing Interim Review, the Lecturer concerned will pass Interim Review.

Unsuccessful Interim Review

If the Promotions Committee's decision is that the Lecturer has not passed Interim Review, the Lecturer will be informed of this decision in writing with an outline summary of reasons as soon as possible after the meeting. The Lecturer will be advised that he/she has a right, if he/she wishes, to appeal against the decision of the Promotions Committee. Further information about the appeal process is available on request from Human Resources. The School will normally extend the staff member's end date of his or her existing contract by one year in order to allow the staff member time to find alternative employment.

Successful Major Review

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a Lecturer fulfils the requirements for passing Major Review, the Lecturer concerned will pass Major Review and will be appointed to an open-ended contract.

Lecturers successful at Major Review will remain on the Lecturer grade and will become post-Major Review Lecturers, unless they opt into the New Academic Career structure in which case they become post-Major Review Assistant Professors. Post-Major Review Lecturers and post-Major Review Assistant Professors are referred to **Section 1.5** of the Guidelines for Review and Promotion of Assistant and Associate Professor for information on promotion to Associate Professor, available on the [Human Resources website](#).

Unsuccessful Major Review

If the Promotions Committee's decision is that the Lecturer has not passed Major Review, the Lecturer will be informed of this decision in writing with an outline summary of reasons as soon as possible after the Promotions Committee meeting. The Lecturer will be advised that he/she has a right, if he/she wishes, to appeal against the decision of the Promotions Committee. Further information about the appeal process for Lecturers is available on request from Human Resources. The School will normally extend the staff member's end date of his or her existing contract by one year in order to allow the staff member time to find alternative employment.

9.2 Salary Determination

Major Review

Staff passing Major Review will normally be rewarded with one additional increment from the following 1 August.

PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: Terms of Reference and Membership

1. Purpose of Committee

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

2. Membership

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Committee is supported by Human Resources.

3. Nomination Procedure

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

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

4. Term of Office

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

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

5. Code of Conduct

Committee members are expected to take a School-wide view of the issues before them and not to represent departmental views. 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 (including award of Major Review Teaching Prizes) and Promotions as well as proposals put forward under the annual promotion round for research staff promotions to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Research Fellow and Professorial Research Fellow, and to report annually to the Appointments Committee.

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

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

3.4. To have oversight of equality and diversity issues in relation to the annual promotion and review round; to receive reports on the profile of promotion and review candidates by gender and ethnicity with a view to looking at potential inequalities and ensuring that School procedures do not discriminate. To make recommendations to the Appointments Committee as appropriate on equality and diversity issues in respect of promotion and review procedures.

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

3.6 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on any issues referred by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee arising from the operation of the *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 Pro-Director (Faculty Development), the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee, the Appointments Committee, and other School committees/fora, or arising from the outcomes of the Staff Survey or the work of the Staff Consultative Council.

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

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

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

5. Frequency of Meetings

5.1 The annual schedule of Committee meetings is published in the School meetings calendar.

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

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

6. Chair

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

7. Voting

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

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: 2018-19

Ex Officio	Pro-Director Faculty Development (Chair) Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee Pro Director – Education	Professor Eric Neumayer Professor Charles Stafford Professor Dilly Fung
GROUP 1	Finance Management Management	Professor Ulf Axelson ² Professor Chrisanthi Avgerou ² Professor Yona Rubinstein ²
GROUP 2	Government International Relations International Development European Institute	Professor Katrin Flikschuh ¹ Professor Karen Smith ¹ Professor Kathryn Hochstetler ² Professor Jonathan White ¹
GROUP 3	Economics Philosophy Statistics Mathematics Language Centre	Professor Francesco Caselli ¹ Professor Piotr Fryzlewicz ¹ Professor Mihail Zervos ¹
GROUP 4	Anthropology Social Policy Methodology Sociology Gender Institute Media and Communications Social Psychology	Professor Wendy Sigle Professor Myria Georgiou ¹
GROUP 5	Geography and Environment International History Law Economic History	Professor Christian Hilber ² Professor Nigel Ashton ² Professor Susan Marks ²

¹ Serving first year of a two-year term, 2018-20

² Serving second year of a two-year term, 2017-19.

Last updated 19 June 2018

PROMOTION AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC STAFF: TIMETABLE FOR 2018-19

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

Michaelmas Term:	Thursday 27 September – Friday 14 December
Mon 8 October 2018	Heads of Department's Deadline 1 (see Annex D for details)
Mon 29 October 2018	Heads of Department's Deadline 2 (see Annex D for details)
Wed 14 November 2018	Promotions Committee (Schedule of Business) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers Departmental External Experts Lists for use in the current Review and Promotions round. Receives names of Review and Promotion candidates and approves Referees to be consulted forthwith. Approves allocation of Departmental Assessors and External Experts to advise on Review and Promotion cases. Considers proposals for advancement / deferral of Interim Review / Major Review. Appoints Internal Readers and Monitors to read the writings of candidates for all cases except those for Interim Review.
Wed 21 November 2018	Promotions Committee (Interim Reviews) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Takes decisions on Interim Reviews of Assistant Professors
Lent Term:	Monday 14 January – Friday 29 March
Tue 5 March, Wed 6 March & Thu 7 March 2019	Promotions Committee (Major Review and Promotion cases) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To consider proposals for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor, proposals for Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only) and proposals for Promotion to Professor Takes decisions on Major Review of Lecturers. Takes decisions on promotions of research staff. <p>HEADS OF DEPARTMENT are asked to ensure they are present in the School and available to attend this meeting, if called.</p>
Summer Term:	Monday 29 April – Friday 14 June
Wed 15 May 2019*	Promotions Committee (Annual Review) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To conduct an annual review of policy and procedures in light of the current session's Promotion and Review round, with proposals for changes to policy / procedure recommended to the annual meeting of the Appointments Committee.
Wed 5 June 2019	Appointments Committee (VCAC's Annual Report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposals for changes to policy / procedure in respect of the annual academic promotion and review round, recommended by the Promotions Committee. A report on the general pattern of quality and procedures for academic appointments across and within the School.

* For Promotions Committee members only, please note this date and time is currently being reviewed.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO DEADLINES FOR REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

Departments must submit the documentation outlined below to Human Resources at:
hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk.

Case type	HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 8 October 2018)	HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 29 October 2018)
Department Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A final Departmental External Experts/ Assessor List A final Departmental Journal List 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing required
Interim Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of Department's Statement G/1 CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8
Deferred Interim Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing required
Advanced Interim Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 Request to Advance Interim or Major Review G/10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of Department's Statement G/1
Major Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Referees for Major Reviews G/4 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of Department's Statement G/1 Electronic copies of 4 writings* Electronic copies of any book reviews* Departmental Teaching Observation G/6**
Deferred Major Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 Request to Advance / Defer Interim or Major Review G/10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nothing required
Advanced Major Review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CV, including teaching contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record G/2 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 Referees for Major Reviews G/4 Request to Advance Interim or Major Review G/10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of Department's Statement G/1 Electronic copies of 4 writings* Electronic copies of any book reviews* Departmental Teaching Observation G/6**

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

** If impossible, then strictly no later than 28 February 2019.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO PEER REVIEWERS (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)

All Referees to be submitted on **Referees form G/4 by HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 8 October 2018)** to hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

The Selection Criteria for Referees (Section 7.2) must be followed when making recommendations, any queries must be directed as soon as possible to the VCAC in the first instance.

	Completed By
External Referee	Head of Department
External Referee	Head of Department
External Referee	Head of Department
External Referee	Head of Department
External Referee (Reserve)	Head of Department
Internal Reader	VCAC / Promotions Committee
Monitor	VCAC / Promotions Committee
TLC reports	Human Resources / Teaching and Learning Centre

FORM TEMPLATE SAMPLES

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

They are available for download on the [Human Resources website](#).

- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 1. | Head of Department's Statement | G/1 |
| 2. | CV Template | G/2 |
| 3. | CV Template Instructions for Candidates | G/3 |
| 4. | Referees for Major Review Form | G/4 |
| 5. | Departmental Teaching Observation Form | G/6 |
| 6. | Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form | G/8 |
| 7. | Request for Advancement / Deferral of Interim Review
and / or Major Review of Lecturers | G/10 |