

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 |