

GUIDELINES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION OF ASSISTANT AND ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS 2022-2023

Contents

1. Introduction to the Guidelines
2. Timing of Review and Promotion in the Academic Session
3. Criteria for Review and Promotion
4. Role of the Head of Department in the Review and Promotion Process
5. Contributions to Education
6. Contributions to Citizenship
7. Candidates' Submitted Writings in Support of Case
8. External Peer Review
9. Procedures of the Review and Promotion Process
10. 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:

Nikhil Kalghatgi, HR Manager, Review and Promotion (Secretary to the Appointments Committee)
Human Resources Division, LRB 5th Floor
Email: hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES	5
1.1	Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)	5
1.2	Impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic on Review and Promotion	5
1.3	Introduction to Interim Review and Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor	5
1.4	Introduction to Promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Lecturers or Assistant Professors	6
1.5	Departmental Sponsorship for Promotion.....	6
1.6	Introduction to the Self-Sponsored Promotion Route	6
1.7	Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances	7
1.8	Disability and the Promotion Process	8
1.9	Part-Time Staff	9
1.10	Interviews.....	9
1.11	Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission.....	9
1.12	Department of Management.....	9
1.13	GDPR and Data Protection - Confidentiality of Promotion and the Review Process	9
1.14	Academic Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring	10
1.15	General	10
2.	TIMING OF REVIEW AND PROMOTION IN THE ACADEMIC SESSION	11
2.1	Timing of Interim Review	11
2.2	Timing of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor	11
2.3	Additional Year to Review Schedules for Assistant Professors due to Covid-19 Pandemic.....	11
2.4	Interim Review and Major Review in the Same Session.....	12
2.5	Timing of Promotions.....	12
2.6	Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion to Professor in the Same Session....	12
2.7	Deferral of Interim or Major Review	12
2.8	Automatic Interruption and Stopping of Review 'Clock'.....	13
2.9	Additional Research Leave	14
2.10	Out-of-phase Retention Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor Cases	15
3.	CRITERIA FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION.....	16
3.1	Aim of Interim Review	16
3.2	Criteria for Interim Review	16
3.3	Failure at Interim Review	17

3.4	<u>Aim of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor</u>	17
3.5	<u>Criteria for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor (and Promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Lecturers and Assistant Professors)</u>	17
3.6	<u>Failure at Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor</u>	19
3.7	<u>Criteria for Promotion to Professor</u>	19
3.8	<u>Unsuccessful promotion proposals</u>	21
4.	<u>ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS</u>	22
4.1	<u>Functions of the Head of Department</u>	22
4.2	<u>Administrative workload of pre-Interim Review Assistant Professors</u>	22
4.3	<u>Research Student Supervision of Assistant Professors</u>	22
4.4	<u>Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee</u>	22
4.5	<u>Departmental Support for Review and Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate</u> ...	23
4.6	<u>Head of Department's Role in Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor</u>	24
4.7	<u>Head of Department's Statement</u>	24
4.8	<u>Content of the Head of Department's Statement for Major Review and Promotion</u>	25
4.9	<u>Responsibility for Submission of the Self-Sponsored Case for Promotion to the Promotions Committee</u>	26
4.10	<u>Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement</u>	27
5	<u>CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION</u>	26
5.1	<u>Self-evaluative commentary on Contributions to Education</u>	26
5.2	<u>Teaching Observations</u>	27
5.3	<u>LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Requirement for New Assistant Professors</u>	28
6	<u>CONTRIBUTIONS TO CITIZENSHIP</u>	26
6.1	<u>Self-evaluative commentary on Contributions to Citizenship</u>	26
7	<u>CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE</u>	27
7.1	<u>Work cited on the CV</u>	27
7.2	<u>Work cited on the CV for Interim Review</u>	27
7.3	<u>Work submitted for Major Review or Promotion</u>	27
8	<u>EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW</u>	29
8.1	<u>Role of External Referees in the Review and Promotions Process</u>	29
8.2	<u>Criteria for Selection of External Referees</u>	30
8.3	<u>Role of Departmental Assessors and External Experts in the Review and Promotions Process</u>	31
8.4	<u>Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts/ Assessor List</u>	33
8.5	<u>Confidentiality</u>	34
9	<u>PROCEDURES OF THE REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS</u>	35

<u>9.1</u>	<u>Procedure for Interim Review or Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor</u>	<u>35</u>
<u>9.2</u>	<u>Consideration of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion Cases.....</u>	<u>37</u>
<u>9.3</u>	<u>Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>9.4</u>	<u>Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review</u>	<u>38</u>
<u>9.5</u>	<u>Emergency Procedures for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor / Promotion to Professor</u>	<u>39</u>
<u>10</u>	<u>DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>10.1</u>	<u>Notification of Decisions</u>	<u>42</u>
<u>10.2</u>	<u>Salary Determination</u>	<u>43</u>

Annexes

- Annex A: Promotions Committee Terms of Reference and Membership
- Annex B: Membership of the Promotions Committee 2022-2023
- Annex C: Timetable for Promotion and Review of Academic Staff 2022-2023
- Annex D: Reference Guide to Deadlines for Review and Promotion Documentation
- Annex E: Reference Guide to Peer Reviewers (External & Internal)
- Annex F: Recipients of Documentation within the Academic Review and Promotion Process

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE GUIDELINES

These guidelines provide information about the processes and criteria governing review and promotion of Assistant and Associate Professors as well as post-Major Review Lecturers.

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

Decisions about success at Interim Review, Major Review or about success for promotion proposals are made solely on merit, as gauged by the staff member's research and scholarship, teaching, and the contribution they are making to the work of the Department and the School. Review and promotion considerations will take account of the School's Policy Statement on Equality and Diversity and will recognise the existence of non-standard and interrupted careers.

The Promotions Committee's terms of reference and membership for the current session, are set out at **Annex A** and **Annex B** to these Guidelines 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.

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

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

1.1 Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee (VCAC)

Professor Emily Jackson is the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee (VCAC) The VCAC may be contacted at e.jackson@lse.ac.uk for advice on specific cases throughout the session. The VCAC works closely with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) Professor Charles Stafford.

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

The Promotions Committee is aware that the Covid-19 pandemic has had a very significant, and in some cases dramatic, impact on the work of colleagues in the School. Where relevant information about this is provided, it will be taken into account in the evaluation of review and promotion cases. This can be provided on the *Head of Department's Statement G/1*; on the *CV template G/2* (in a dedicated section that has been added for the declaration of Covid-19 impacts), as well as on the addenda to the CV – that is, the additional statements on research achievements, research trajectory, contributions to education and contributions to citizenship; on the *Request for Deferral G/7*; on the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8* (in particular, where the impacts to be declared are confidential in nature); and on the *Self-sponsored Promotion Proposal – Candidate's Statement G/9* in cases of self-sponsorship.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Post-Major Review Lecturers who opt into the New Academic Career become post-Major Review Assistant Professors. Lecturers who have already passed Major Review can be put forward for promotion to Associate Professor by their Department or can self-sponsor a promotion case (with or without having opted into the New Academic Career before their case is submitted for consideration by the Promotions Committee). They will be considered only for promotion to Associate Professor and will not undergo Major Review a second time and the criteria for promotion to Associate Professor will apply. Successful promotion to Associate Professor signifies the candidate's intent to opt in to the New Academic Career structure (if they have not done so already), and the New Academic Career structure terms and conditions will be effective from the following 1 August.

1.5 Departmental Sponsorship for Promotion

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

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

1.6 Introduction to the Self-Sponsored Promotion Route

Associate Professors may propose their own promotion to (full) Professor, and post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors may propose their own Promotion to Associate Professor, if their Departments do not intend to recommend them. All members of academic staff are notified of the annual Promotion and Review timetable and corresponding deadlines for submission of promotion proposals by Human Resources.

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

A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation can be found at **Annex D**, and the procedure is dealt with under **Section 9.3**.

1.7 Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances

The School expects that if staff members' individual circumstances are affecting their day-to-day activities or performance the individual would have raised these at the earliest opportunity with their Department and the Department will have addressed these issues, with the advice of Human Resources, as soon as reasonably possible. Furthermore, the School expects that most circumstances do not need to be stated on the Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/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 Equality Act 2010, for example conditions such as cancer, chronic fatigue syndrome and mental health conditions
- Other instances of ill health or injury not covered above
- Constraints relating to pregnancy, maternity, breastfeeding, adoption, paternity or childcare in addition to periods of parental leave taken. This could include, for example, pregnancy related illness or the health of a child
- Other caring responsibilities (for example caring for an elderly, ill, or disabled relative)
- Other significant life event, for example gender reassignment or bereavement of a family member

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

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

The *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/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 nature of the circumstances, the support being provided and whether any other adjustments are necessary (e.g. reasonable adjustments in case of a disability). The details of the circumstances will not be disclosed to the Promotions Committee.

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 gather further information on the background of the case. Human Resources may, if the candidate has informed the Head of Department of the individual circumstances, request a more detailed statement from the Head of Department (including in self-sponsored cases) to aid advice to the VCAC (this information **will not** be shared with the Promotions Committee) and 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 referrals, specialist reports and recommendations (where applicable)
- Action taken by the Department, including any reasonable adjustments made to the candidate's role in the Department, flexible working arrangements, mentoring,
- Departmental commitments including administration
- The effectiveness of those adjustments in increasing the candidate's ability to carry out their duties
- Career advice given in Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) meetings and agreed actions.

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

Please refer to **Annexes C and D** for the deadline of submission of the *Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances Form G/8*.

1.8 Disability and the Promotion Process

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

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

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

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

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

1.9 Part-Time Staff

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

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

1.10 Interviews

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

There is no entitlement to interview for either the candidate or the Head of Department, although in exceptional circumstances the Promotions Committee may invite a Head of Department or, for self-sponsored promotion cases, the candidate to attend – if, for example, there is a need for factual clarification in a particular case. Wherever possible, Heads of Department (and in the case of self-sponsorship, the self-sponsored candidate) should be in the School and available on the dates the Promotions Committee meets (in the Lent term) to consider Major Reviews and promotions (dates of this session's meetings are available at **Annex C** of these Guidelines and on the [Human Resources website](#)).

1.11 Submission of Documentation and Deadlines for Submission

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

In cases of self-sponsored promotion the individual may submit the promotion documentation directly to Human Resources (or via their Head of Department as desired) in accordance with the deadlines for submission.

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

1.12 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 academic promotions and reviews 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.

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

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

All persons asked to provide statements, references and reports about candidates for promotion and review are advised that their documentation is confidential to the Promotions Committee and will be used solely for the purposes of the School's Review and Promotion

processes. However, in circumstances such as a Major Review appeal hearing, grievance or legal proceedings, reports may have to be disclosed to a third party. In the interests of fairness, the Promotions Committee will not accept comments, either written or verbal, from third parties (those from whom comments had not been formally solicited).

1.14 Academic Career Development Review Scheme and Mentoring

The Promotions Committee expects that all non-Professorial academics, and particularly those coming up for Interim Review or Major Review, will receive constructive advice on career development from senior academic colleagues. 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 ACDR is operating effectively at departmental level, and in particular for ensuring that 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 Staff Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme and for reporting on any issues to the Promotions Committee.

Mentoring

For Assistant Professors the role of the Mentor is of importance in supporting career development. Heads of Department are responsible for ensuring that Assistant Professors are assigned a department Mentor, and for reporting this information to the first meeting of the Promotions Committee every session. The Mentoring Scheme is **distinct** from the CDR. Mentors give informal and frequent advice and provide a listening ear throughout the year, whereas formal CDR Meetings take place annually for Assistant Professors and are normally conducted by the Head of Department. Importantly, the mentor cannot be the one holding the CDR Meeting. The Assistant Professor's Mentor and the Head of Department share responsibility for supporting the Assistant Professor towards their Interim Review and Major Review. Assistant Professors who encounter difficulties in the mentoring relationship are advised to discuss the situation with their Head of Department in the first instance to explore whether a change of Mentor is necessary. The Mentoring Guidelines are available on the [Human Resources website](#).

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

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

1.15 General

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

2. TIMING OF REVIEW AND PROMOTION IN THE ACADEMIC SESSION

2.1 Timing of Interim Review

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

Interim Reviews are expected to take place in the third year of appointment for Assistant Professors appointed before 2017 and in the fourth year of appointment for Assistant Professors appointed from 2017 onwards. There is scope for the Interim Review to be held earlier or later than this if circumstances warrant the advancement or deferral with a maximum deferral to the fifth year of the appointment. Information about the procedures to follow for deferral of Interim Review is provided in **Section 2.7** below.

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

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

2.2 Timing of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

For Assistant Professors appointed post-Interim Review, the School expects the Major Review normally to take place within **five years** of the appointment date for Assistant Professors appointed before 2017, and within **four years** of appointment for Assistant Professors appointed from 2017 onwards. Though exceptionally an extension of a maximum of one year can be requested where pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming (see also **Section 2.7** below).

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

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

At the end of the 2019-20 academic session, the Appointments Committee took the decision to add one year to the Interim Review and/or Major Review schedules of all currently employed Assistant Professors. This was in recognition of the very significant impact of the Covid-19

pandemic on many colleagues' work, and on their research work in particular.

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

Importantly, if candidates take advantage of the additional year facility, this will not be treated as an additional period in which they could have been productive – that is, although they have had more time on the clock, the expectation will not be higher.

2.4 Interim Review and Major Review in the Same Session

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

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

2.5 Timing of Promotions

Promotions are considered annually in the Lent term of each session.

After an unsuccessful promotion attempt, there will be a period of two years before another proposal will be considered by the Promotions Committee, unless the Promotions Committee itself decides to waive this rule in its decision on a given case. There is no limit on the number of occasions on which a candidate may be put forward for promotion. When considering a promotion proposal, the Promotions Committee will not have before it information about any previous unsuccessful promotion proposal(s) from that candidate.

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

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

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

2.7 Deferral of Interim or Major Review

Deferral of Interim Review

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

- Family related absence
- Personal circumstances which have disrupted normal duties that are not classified as an

- automatic interruption
- Academic leave (for example buyout leave)
- A change in hours of work (for example a temporary period of part-time working or a permanent reduction in hours)
- Pertinent new information is likely to be forthcoming.

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

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

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

The reasons for the deferral request should be set out by the Head of Department on the *Request to Defer Interim or Major Review Form G/7* and submitted with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Requests for deferral of Interim Review should ideally be submitted in time for the May review meeting of the Promotions Committee in the year prior to the candidate's scheduled Interim Review.

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

Deferral of Major Review

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

The reasons for the deferral request should be set out by the Head of Department on the *Request to Defer Interim or Major Review Form G/7* and submitted together with the candidate's CV completed on the *CV Template G/2* for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Requests for deferral of Major Review should ideally be submitted in time for the May review meeting of the Promotions Committee in the year prior to the candidate's scheduled Major Review

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

2.8 Automatic Interruption and Stopping of Review ‘Clock’

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

Incapacity due to certificated long term illness or disability will be reviewed on a case by case basis and may also be designated as an automatic interruption, with the academic staff member's Review schedule updated accordingly. In these circumstances, both the Head of Department and the individual staff member are encouraged to be in contact with their HR

Partner in the first instance at their earliest opportunity. Appropriate support (including reasonable adjustments where relevant) should first have been considered and implemented before a decision is taken to stop the review clock.

Heads of Department are not required to request deferral of Interim Review and/or Major Review on grounds of leave of this kind. Once Human Resources has been informed of an academic staff member's intention to take family leave in accordance with the above, their Review schedule will be updated accordingly unless a member of staff specifically requests that the session date for their Interim Review and/or Major Review should remain as under the original timescale. Following notification that a member of staff will be taking family leave, Human Resources will inform the member of staff of the provision for extension and ascertain their wishes regarding the session date for Interim and/or Major Review. Human Resources will inform the candidate's Head of Department of any proposed change to the timing of Interim or Major Review following the candidate's response. Incapacity due to certificated long term illness or disability will be reviewed on a case by case basis and will follow the same procedure as family leave above.

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

2.9 Additional Research Leave

Academic staff who are employed under the terms and conditions of the New Academic Career are entitled to a period of additional research leave following long-term absence from the School in a number of specific circumstances. The purpose of this additional research leave is for these Staff members to re-establish their research trajectory following a long period of absence. Research leave mirrors sabbatical leave in character, i.e. staff members will be relieved of their teaching and administrative duties, but differs in both its operation and the circumstances in which it can be taken.

These academic staff are not required to have accrued service in order to access this provision. However, whilst research leave is an automatic entitlement, it is not mandatory. Heads of Department are expected to facilitate periods of leave under this provision for those academic staff who qualify. Additional research leave will apply in the following circumstances:

Type of Absence	Leave Entitlement
Maternity or adoption leave for a total period of sixteen weeks or greater	One term
Shared Parental Leave for a period of sixteen weeks or greater	One term
Long-term sickness absence	Determined on a case-by-case basis as part of an individual's return to work plan by the Head of Department, with HR Partner advice (up to one term).

Absences of less than sixteen weeks in total will not normally attract additional research leave.

Where a staff member has a long-term period of absence that falls outside one of these categories, their Head of Department can make a discretionary case for additional research leave to the Pro-Director (Faculty Development). The decision of the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) is final and there is no right of appeal.

As the purpose of research leave is to re-establish a faculty member's research trajectory, research leave must normally be taken within one year of the employee returning to work. Research leave not taken during this timeframe will be lost, unless the Head of Department

and Pro-Director (Faculty Development) approve an alternative arrangement in the individual case.

Should a staff member leave the School before having taken any research leave they are entitled to, there will be no payment in lieu of untaken leave.

Academic staff members who are taking a planned period of family leave should discuss and agree the timing of their research leave with their Head of Department before they embark upon their planned family leave. Heads of Department may be willing to allow for later agreement, but this is at their discretion.

Whilst academic staff do not need to 'make a case' for taking this type of research leave, it is implicit within this leave type that staff on research leave will be primarily focusing upon their research activities. As such, the leave should not be taken to enable the staff member to take up teaching, or other remunerated activity, at an alternative institution or establishment.

Equally, it is not expected that staff will use this leave as a substitution for other childcare arrangements.

The additional research leave will normally commence on the first day of term for the full term allowance. Heads of Department can, as a matter of discretion, choose to vary this requirement should the operational needs of the Department permit this, e.g. to enable research leave to be taken immediately following family leave.

Academic staff do not need to submit a formal application for additional research leave, but leave should be agreed in advance with the Head of Department. The Head of Department and the academic staff member should notify the Human Resources Division, via their HR Partner, of the arrangement that they have agreed. HR Partners are also available for advice at an earlier stage of the process where this is needed.

It is generally expected that colleagues will cover the duties of staff on research leave, but it is accepted that the expertise of the member of staff on leave will not necessarily be replicated within the Department and that, in these cases, replacement teaching expertise may need to be bought in.

2.10 Out-of-phase Retention Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor Cases

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

The emergency Major Review and promotion procedures are dealt with in detail in **Section 8.5 – Emergency Procedures**.

3. CRITERIA FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION

3.1 Aim of Interim Review

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

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

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

3.2 Criteria for Interim Review

In considering Interim Reviews the Promotions Committee will evaluate the candidate's activities with respect to research and publications, teaching, and contributions to the Department.

Criteria for Interim Review (Assistant Professors appointed before 2017)

- Evidence of an emerging research programme with, at minimum, high-quality work submitted for publication, and a coherent and feasible plan for future work towards Major Review
- Evidence of high-quality teaching
- Successful completion of the PGCertHE Full Fellowship programme or an equivalent qualification (if appointed in 2014-15 or later)
- Evidence of constructive contributions to the life of the Department

Criteria for Interim Review (Assistant Professors appointed from 2017 onwards)

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

The Promotions Committee will base its decision on the following:

- A CV presented on the standard template including (i) a detailed and self-evaluative statement on the candidate's contributions to education, (ii) a detailed statement of the candidate's research and publication achievements and plans, including an approximate schedule for completion of projects, any planned grant applications, projected publication outlets, and proposals for dissemination, and (iii) a statement from the candidate on their contributions to citizenship within the Department and across the School
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department. Departments should inform the Promotions Committee about the typical lag between submission, review, and publication in the field's journals, the relative importance of books and journal articles, and relevant aspects of recruitment procedures, in order to allow judgement on an appropriate combination of published works and evaluation of evidence of the research trajectory and

quality. The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) process

- School student teaching survey results
- For Assistant Professors appointed from 2017 onwards: A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources.

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

3.3 Failure at Interim Review

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

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

3.4 Aim of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

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

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

The criteria for Major Review under the New Academic Career structure/promotion to Associate Professor are as follows:

Research productivity and excellence.

A candidate should demonstrate intellectual originality, a high level of productivity in work of significant interest, and valuable contributions to research-based knowledge. This will normally

be evidenced by:

- Publication of research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books that is, at least, internationally excellent in terms of originality, significance and rigour. Candidates should normally present four research publications, though this is not a binding requirement and overall quality is more important than quantity
- Indicators of influence in the candidate's scholarly field, for example reviews and citations
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions
- Supportive external assessments by competent experts
- A detailed and convincing written research statement showing the intellectual agenda guiding the candidate's work, its likely importance to her or his field and/or the public, and its future potential

It may also be evidenced by:

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

Strong and very high quality teaching.

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

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

Contributions to departmental and/or School governance and administration.

These may be evidenced by:

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

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

- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their contributions to education, a research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement from the candidate on their contributions to citizenship within the Department and across the School
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department and/or the School 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 Career Development Review (CDR) process
- Eden Centre Teaching Observation Report, if deemed a requirement by the Pro-Director

(Faculty Development), the Pro-Director (Education) and the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee

- School student survey results
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources
- Evidence from external peer review

Citation Evidence in 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).

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

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

3.6 Failure at Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

3.7 Criteria for Promotion to Professor

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

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

In addition to research leadership, candidates will show strong contributions to teaching. Ideally these will include not only excellence in individual teaching but also leadership in teaching (for example, in mentoring more junior teachers or in course development and improvement). Weight will also be given, as appropriate to different fields, to success in entrepreneurial activities, public engagement, informing public policy, and providing service to fields of professional practice.

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

The criteria for promotion are:

- A substantial body of published research including articles in peer reviewed journals and/or books. Candidates should present four research publications selected from their publication portfolio, all of which must be published or have been accepted for publication. (For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form.) All submitted items must be at least internationally excellent and two of the submitted items must be world leading in terms of originality, rigour and significance. Consistent with the School's emphasis on quality of publications as a pre-eminent criterion, candidates may exceptionally submit fewer than four publications. In such cases, a statement of justification from the Head of Department is required. Submitted publications should, other than in exceptional circumstances, not have been used as outputs submitted for Major Review. For candidates appointed to the School post-Major Review, submitted publications should have been published after the equivalent of Major Review in their previous appointment. Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department.
- An international reputation as evidenced by reviews of publications, citations, prizes and honours, and assessments by peers.
- A coherent and viable programme of future research and intellectual contributions.
- A record of successful and innovative teaching at all levels, including a track record of successful PhD supervision.
- Evidence of management capabilities as demonstrated by significant contributions to departmental and School administration.
- Contribution to the development and performance of colleagues through coaching, mentoring and peer support.

The Promotions Committee will also take account of the following:

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

The Promotions Committee 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 contributions to education, a research achievement record, a statement of planned research and a statement from the candidate on their contributions to citizenship within the Department and across the School
- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department and/or the School.
- The statement from the candidate's Head of Department should also comment on the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) process
- Eden Centre Teaching Observation Report, if deemed a requirement by the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), the Pro-Director (Education) and the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee
- School student survey results
- A Report from an Internal Reader (normally a member of the Promotions Committee) and comments of a Monitor (also normally a Committee member) on the pieces of work nominated by the candidate and submitted to Human Resources.
- Evidence from external peer review

Citation Evidence in Promotion cases:

The Promotions Committee will accept citation evidence in subject areas where this is a useful measure of research quality. The availability of such evidence will be taken into account by the Promotions Committee 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).

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

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

3.8 Unsuccessful promotion proposals

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

4. ROLE OF THE HEAD OF DEPARTMENT IN THE REVIEW AND PROMOTION 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:

Career Development of all non-Professorial Academic Staff

- To ensure that all non-Professorial academic staff, and particularly those coming up for review and promotion, 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 academic career development review meetings (ACDR Meetings), where not undertaken by the Head of Department, and ensuring that ACDR Meetings are conducted where appropriate.

Assistant Professors

- To ensure that Assistant Professors receive appropriate career development advice and support from senior members of academic staff;
- To appoint Departmental Mentors for Assistant Professors;
- To keep under review with departmental Professorial colleagues the progress of Assistant Professors towards Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and to be responsible for the submission of proposals for Interim Review and Major Review to the Promotions Committee;

Promotion of Academic Staff

- To keep under review with departmental professorial colleagues the possible claims to promotion of all Associate Professors and, where relevant, post-Major Review Lecturers or Assistant Professors and to be responsible for the presentation and submission of department promotion proposals to the Promotions Committee.

There is an annual timetable governing submission of proposals for Interim Review and Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to (full) Professor 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 with promotion to Associate Professor, and promotion to Professor, can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 9 – Procedures**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the [Human Resources website](#).

4.2 Administrative workload of pre-Interim Review Assistant Professors

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

4.3 Research Student Supervision of Assistant Professors

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 pre-Major Review members of staff do not have lead supervisory responsibility for research students.

4.4 Responsibility for Submission of the Case to the Promotions Committee

Heads of Department are responsible for the electronic submission of all documentation listed in **Sections 4.2, 4.5 and 4.7** concerning Review and departmentally-sponsored

Promotion proposals to the Promotions Committee via Human Resources, except the Eden Centre Teaching Report where relevant. It follows that Heads of Department are expected to take an active role in advising candidates on 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 (unless for self-sponsored promotion cases).

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

Documentation for the Promotion and 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 Review and Promotion Candidates: Views of the Departmental Professoriate

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

The Head of Department 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 with promotion to Associate Professor, promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors only) or promotion to Professor. The Committee expects that a decision will be taken 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 Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor before their normally scheduled Major Review in accordance with **Section 2.2** unless they have majority support of those voting. The Promotions Committee does not regard unanimity of the departmental Professoriate as a *sine qua non* of a successful case, but does expect that if there are differing opinions these will be explained in full in the *Head of Department's Statement G/1*.

Departments may solicit external references to inform their decision on whether to support a candidate for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and/or a candidate for promotion to Professor. Where Departments do so, the following rules apply:

- The list of referees needs to be approved by the VCAC who will apply the same criteria as listed in **Section 8.2** Criteria for Selection of External Referees.
- Candidates should be invited to nominate up to 50 per cent of the referees.
- The soliciting letter/email needs to be approved by the VCAC. To maximise the usefulness of references, referees should be sent the writings that would be submitted to the School's Promotions Committee and 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 with Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

4.7 Head of Department's Statement

Interim Review

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

The statement should also confirm that Academic Staff Career Development Review (CDR) meetings have taken place and outline the career development advice provided to the candidate and any relevant issues raised in the meetings. See **Section 1.12** on the Scheme for Academic Career Development Review and Mentoring, or the [Human Resources website](#), for more information.

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

Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

The Promotions Committee views the Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor as one of the most important decisions for the School. The evidence in the Head of Department's Statement G/1 is of particular weight. The Promotions Committee would expect that should the Head of Department have any serious concerns regarding the Assistant Professor's prospects for a successful Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, the Head of Department would have sought the advice of the VCAC and, if appropriate, an HR Partner at an earlier stage.

If candidates are nominated before the maximum time limit specified in their appointment letter, Heads of Department should make the case that the candidate is ready to undergo Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor. Heads of Department are encouraged to seek guidance from the VCAC.

Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors only) and Promotion to Professor

The Promotions Committee expects Heads of Department to frame their statements with the relevant respective promotion criteria in mind.

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

The Promotions Committee expects Heads of Department to address the following areas in their reports on candidates:

1. *Academic Profile:*

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

2. *Research Productivity and Excellence:*

The Head of Department should indicate their opinion of the quality of the candidate's research, published outputs, and future trajectory - including, where appropriate, the candidate's success in publishing in the top journals or with the top presses in the field. Heads of Department should indicate any issues where journal lead-times may be a factor affecting the quantity of published output. **The Head of Department is expected to comment in detail on the quality of each of the publications submitted to the Promotions Committee.** Where possible, they should comment specifically on the originality of the candidate's intellectual contribution (noting that this may be especially important in cases where work is co-authored and the individual contribution of the candidate may not be obvious to readers).

The Head of Department should outline the departmental view on the assessment of research quality including, where appropriate:

- Prestige publishing outlets which may include the titles of the top journals and top presses in the field
- The relative weighting, if any, given to articles over books or vice-versa
- Whether co-authorship is the norm within the field, and comment on any joint-authored work submitted
- Clarifying the significance of conference contributions in the candidate's field
- Whether 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 Departmental Journal Lists, which are submitted to the Promotions Committee at its first meeting of the session, to inform its decision-making and evaluation of candidates.

Citation Evidence:

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

3. *Teaching Quality:*

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

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

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

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

Departmental Teaching Observations

The Departmental Teaching Observation is no longer a requirement, however if it is considered beneficial for the candidate, a Head of Department may wish to carry one out. In the case that a Head of Department carries out an observation, the report should be submitted on the observation form G/6.

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

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

5. *Career Development:*

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

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

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

They are free to submit the self-sponsored proposal through their Head of Department or directly to Human Resources. A reference guide to the deadlines and documentation required can be found at **Annex D**, the Criteria can be found at **Section 3** and the process is dealt with in detail in **Section 9 – Procedures**. Template forms, along with a full copy of this Guidance, can also be found on the [Human Resources website](#).

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate to be submitted by the

HoD Deadline 3 as listed in **Annex D**. The Head of Department will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the departmental professoriate. If the self-sponsored proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit their statement on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

4.10 Self-Sponsored Candidate's Statement

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

5 CONTRIBUTIONS TO EDUCATION

5.1 Self-evaluative commentary on Contributions to Education

Candidates should keep in mind that the Promotions Committee puts much emphasis on a detailed and self-evaluative Contribution to Education statement submitted by candidates and supporting evidence as an addendum to the *CV Template G/2*. This addendum to 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 educational contribution statement.

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

Interim Review

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

Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor

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

Promotion to Professor

- A record of successful and innovative teaching at all levels, including a track record of successful PhD supervision.
- Evidence of management capabilities as demonstrated by significant contributions to departmental and School administration.
- Contribution to the development and performance of colleagues through coaching, mentoring and peer support.

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):

- 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 the Eden Centre/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 education prizes (e.g., Major Review Excellence in Education 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
- For candidates for promotion to Professor only: Track record of mentoring others (possibly including references from staff who have been mentored by the individual) and PhD supervision record in terms of students supervised, completion rates and achievement in terms of prizes and placements.
- Any additional circumstances that they would like the Promotions Committee to be aware of, including a disability or other condition that may have impacted on their teaching and/or education contributions (see **Section 1.6 – Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances**).

Candidates are advised to refer to a range of evidence to substantiate the claims made in the Statement. Candidates are invited to add 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, as well as Departmental and Eden Centre observation reports.

The Promotions Committee is aware of the limitations of using TQARO student survey results as a means of evaluating contributions to education. The Committee seeks to evaluate teaching and wider contributions to education in a holistic way and TQARO student survey results form only one part of the evidence base relating to contributions to education.

The Promotions Committee reserves the right to approach the candidate's Head of Department to request that any evidence of poor teaching should be addressed.

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

5.2 Teaching Observations

Departmental Teaching Observation

A Departmental Teaching Observation is no longer a requirement for review and promotion candidates, however, should it be considered beneficial for a candidate, a Head of Department may wish to carry out an observation. In the case that a Departmental Teaching Observation is carried out, the *Departmental Teaching Observation Form G/6* form should contain an evaluative commentary of the candidate's teaching as observed by the Head of Department or their delegate.

Eden Centre Teaching Observation

Human Resources is responsible for notifying the Eden Centre of the schedule of Major Reviews, Promotions and Self-Sponsored Promotions each session and will liaise with the

Eden Centre in order to arrange the submission of reports. However, the Eden Centre will only conduct Teaching Observations where there are concerns about a candidate's teaching scores and when the Pro-Director (Faculty Development), Pro-Director (Education) and the Vice-Chair of the Appointments Committee deem it to be a requirement.

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

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

The observer should arrange a debrief with the teacher after the session. It will be expected that the observer will let the teacher see the feedback before it is submitted to Human Resources on the Teaching Observation form. The teacher will be free to append any additional relevant comments.

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

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

5.3 LSE Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Requirement for New Assistant Professors

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

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

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

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

For further information, see the PGCertHE website.

6 CONTRIBUTIONS TO CITIZENSHIP

6.1 Self-evaluative commentary on Contributions to Citizenship

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

All staff are expected to fulfil the expectations of their roles, such as being an available and supportive academic mentor (including replying to student emails in a timely manner and writing references); attending and taking part in departmental meetings; and meeting all departmental deadlines, for example for the submission of CVs and CDR forms.

Academic citizenship also involves participating actively in the smooth running of the School, at departmental and at School level, in addition to making a contribution to one's discipline and to society. Being a good academic citizen is about how someone works as well as what they do. All academic staff are expected to uphold the School's values and its commitment to ensuring that the School is a truly inclusive university.

Active academic citizenship within the School typically encompasses the following activities across the course of one's career:

- Actively contributing to the development and realisation of the strategic goals of the department and the School.
- Taking on leadership and management roles appropriate to an individual's position and doing them well.
- Taking on departmental and School administrative roles appropriate to an individual's position and doing them well.
- Volunteering to sit on department and School committees and working groups and making a positive contribution to them.
- Mentoring less experienced colleagues.
- Covering for colleagues when necessary.
- Attending and taking part in departmental Seminars, PhD seminars and PhD upgrade events.
- Attending and taking part in widening participation activities, open days, welcoming activities, student events, graduation ceremonies and alumni events.
- Playing an active role in staff recruitment by serving on appointment panels and attending job talks.
- Promoting equity, diversity and inclusion in all aspects of one's role at the School
- For Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor, there must be evidence of sustained academic citizenship which demonstrates that the person has contributed actively to departmental administration and to School-wide activities.
- For promotion to full Professor, there must be evidence of sustained academic citizenship which demonstrates that the person has made significant contributions to departmental and School-wide strategic management and governance.

7 CANDIDATES' SUBMITTED WRITINGS IN SUPPORT OF CASE

7.1 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 all work should be available, preferably in electronic form, in case the Promotions Committee should request it.

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

7.2 Work cited on the CV for Interim Review

For those Assistant Professors appointed before 2017, there is no requirement for the submission of writings in support of Interim Review. For those Assistant Professors appointed from 2017 onwards, candidates should normally present **two** research publications, though this is not a binding requirement and overall quality is more important than quantity.

7.3 Work submitted for Major Review or Promotion

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

For promotion to Professor cases, the submitted writings should, other than in exceptional cases, not have been used as outputs submitted for Major Review. Invoking such exceptional circumstances requires a statement of justification from the Head of Department. It follows that any writing submitted in support of a candidate's case for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor is ineligible for submission in support of a candidate's case for Promotion to Professor. For candidates appointed to the School post-Major Review, submitted publications should have been published after the equivalent of Major Review in their previous appointment. In addition, all submitted items for promotion to Professor cases must be published or have been accepted for publication.

For all other review and promotion cases, the expectation is that, normally, submitted pieces will be published or have been accepted for publication (accompanied by a confirmation letter / email from the editors / book publishers). For research monographs, an acceptance letter from the publisher stating it is going to publish the work at some future point is not sufficient; instead, the manuscript must be in its finished form. The candidate should normally submit to Human Resources the four writings which they believe best represent their 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.

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 pieces submitted.

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

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

Presentation of Writings

Particular attention should be paid to ensuring that:

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

For items where no electronic copy is available, candidates are encouraged to scan them to make them electronically available. Where this is not feasible, **seven** properly-ordered sets of each writing that are not available electronically, should be submitted to Human Resources, either in the form of original hard copies or photocopies of the original hard copy. 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.

8 EXTERNAL PEER REVIEW

The Promotions Committee solicits external peer review advice as part of its decision-making process for Major Review and promotion 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, External Experts and Departmental Assessor) are willing to be contacted by the VCAC and to participate in the process. In particular, the Head of Department should notify potential Referees that they will be expected to comment specifically and in detail on each of the candidate's submitted writings if they are asked by the VCAC to participate in the process.

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

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

8.1 Role of External Referees in the Review and Promotions Process

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

Interim Review

External peer review is **not normally part** of the Interim Review procedure. However, if a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee are doubtful about the Head of Department's recommendation, the Committee may ask the Head of Department to suggest the names of external referees for the Promotions Committee's consideration. Where it considers it appropriate, the Promotions Committee may canvass the views of one or more such outside referees.

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

Heads of Department are required to provide the names of external referees for each candidate on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/4*. Normally, **eight** names are required in total (including two reserves); four are to be nominated by the Department (including one reserve) and four by the candidate (including one reserve). The Promotions Committee will seek references from at least four of the eight nominated external referees.

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

Referees for Self-Sponsored Promotion

Self-sponsored candidates are required to provide the names of external referees on the *Referees for Major Review and/or Promotion Form G/4*. Normally, candidates should nominate four external referees (including one reserve); an additional four external referees (including one reserve) are to be nominated by the VCAC.

To further ensure the necessary degree of independence in the nomination of external referees for self-sponsored cases, the VCAC will take a view on the suitability of the referees proposed by the self-sponsored candidate and may consult the candidate's Head of Department. Self-sponsored candidates will be expected to provide written justification in any case where the VCAC is of the view that the criteria of selection of external referees (see **Section 8.2**) are not met. The VCAC should be approached for advice on individual cases.

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

In all cases, the Promotions Committee takes the final decision about which referees to consult and is not bound to accept names proposed by the self-sponsored candidate or the VCAC. The Promotions Committee may substitute its own suggestion(s) for those proposed by the candidate or the VCAC.

Referees for Emergency Major Review and/or Promotion

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

8.2 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 or acted as co-investigators with the candidate in the past four years. Heads of Department should seek the advice of the VCAC for disciplines where joint authorship or collaboration is the norm and where co-authors or co-investigators may be best placed to act as referees.
- The naming of referees should not include people who have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

- The naming as referees of eminent scholars who are unfamiliar with a candidate's work or who may not be able to provide anything other than very general comments should be avoided.
- There may be different aspects of a candidate's work to be assessed and referees should be nominated with this in mind and with an indication where appropriate of which aspect(s) a referee is being asked to comment on.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate referees with an appropriate profile which could include referees from outside the Department's discipline.

8.3 Role of Departmental Assessors and External Experts in the Review and Promotions Process

The Promotions Committee invites Heads of Department to review their Departmental External Experts/Assessor List on an annual basis, prior to the commencement of the next promotion round. Departmental External Experts/Assessor Lists are approved at the Promotions Committee's first meeting of each session. **The Promotions Committee expects that Departments ensure that no less than 30 per cent of their External Experts are female. If Departments believe they cannot fulfil this requirement, they must provide the Promotions Committee with a written justification why they cannot fulfil this requirement.**

The respective roles of the Departmental Assessor and External Experts are as follows:

Departmental Assessor:

A Departmental Assessor is a person of high seniority and eminence within the particular discipline with an overview of the subject sufficient to enable him/her to assess all candidates for Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and all candidates for promotion from the department irrespective of specialism.

The Departmental Assessor receives the promotion papers, including the *Head of Department Statement G/1*, for all Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor candidates and all promotion candidates, whether put forward by the department or self-sponsored. It is not a requirement that the Departmental Assessor reviews candidates' writings although writings are available to Assessors on request.

Departments nominate (changes to) their Departmental Assessor or Assessors on the Department's External Experts/Assessors List, submitted to Human Resources in accordance with the deadlines schedule at **Annex D**. Normally, one Departmental Assessor is nominated per Department on their Department's External Experts/Assessors List although there can be reasons why Departments have more than one Departmental Assessor. Please see **Section 8.4 – Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts/Assessors List** for further information.

External Experts:

The role of the External Expert is distinct from that of a Referee. Whereas a Referee may be expected to concentrate on the candidate's major achievements, External Experts are asked to provide an independent and objective evaluation of the candidate's work as a whole, comment specifically on the candidate's planned research as set out in the research trajectory statement, indicate their national and international standing in the specialist field of the discipline and comment on whether or not it would be regarded by other distinguished specialists in the field as anomalous if the candidate was promoted to the level proposed. External Experts are asked to assess the case for promotion on the basis of the candidate's promotion papers (see **Sections 3.5** and **3.7**) although they are not normally expected to provide detailed comments on the submitted writings. Contrary to Referees, External Experts are sent the *Head of Department Statement G/1*.

Departments nominate (changes to) their list of External Experts on the Department's External Experts/Assessors List, submitted to Human Resources in accordance with the deadlines schedule at **Annex D**. Please see **Section 8.4 – Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts/Assessors List** for further information.

Nomination of Departmental Assessor and External Experts for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Departmentally-sponsored Promotion cases

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

In the selection of External Experts for individual promotion cases, the below criteria should be noted in particular:

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

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

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

Self-sponsored promotion candidates are asked to provide External Expert nominations on the *External Experts for Promotion Form G/5*. Candidates should nominate two external experts (including one reserve); an additional two external experts (including one reserve) are to be nominated by the VCAC. These will normally be drawn from departmental lists of External Experts submitted to Human Resources prior to the start of the session.

Self-sponsored promotion candidates may seek a copy of the Departmental External

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

In the selection of External Experts, the criteria listed above for departmentally-sponsored cases will also apply to self-sponsored cases.

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

Duration of Appointment of Departmental Assessors and External Experts

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

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

8.4 Criteria for the nomination of Departmental Assessors and External Experts for the Department's External Experts/ Assessor List

- All Departmental Assessors and External Experts should be employed by a distinguished university.
- Departmental Assessors and External Experts should be confined to those of full Professorial status or equivalent. Heads of Department/Institute should provide written justification in any case where a Departmental Assessor or External Expert does not hold the title of Professor.
- Departmental Assessors and External Experts should not normally have been on the staff of the School in the four previous years, held a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment at the School in the four previous years or hold a Centennial Professorship or visiting appointment currently.
- For candidates with inter- or multi-disciplinary research interests, Heads of Department are encouraged to nominate External Experts with an appropriate profile which could include Experts from outside the Department's existing list of External Experts.
- For any External Expert nominations, the Department/Institute should submit the following on the appropriate template spreadsheet available from Human Resources:
 - External Expert's name and full, authenticated and up-to-date contact details (email and postal address).
- For **all new Departmental Assessor and new External Experts nominations**, the Department should also submit the following:
 - The CV of the nominee
 - A brief statement on the scholarly quality of the person.
 - A brief statement on the institution's international standard compared to that of the School.

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

- That the Departmental Assessor may not also be nominated as a Referee or External Expert for promotion proposals.

- The Departmental Assessor should not, normally, have co-authored or acted as a co-investigator with the candidate in the past four years.
- The Departmental Assessor should not have acted as a PhD supervisor to the candidate.

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

8.5 Confidentiality

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

9 PROCEDURES OF THE REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS

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

The core format of Interim Review and Major Review is that a recommendation from the Assistant Professor's Head of Department on whether the Assistant Professor should pass the relevant Review is made to the Promotions Committee, which then makes the decision 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*

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

Please note that candidates for review and promotion will need to have their student 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 Excellence in Education Prizes see **Section 5.4**.

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

The Assistant Professor has the opportunity to submit to their Head of Department any information that they consider relevant, or to ask for a deferral of the Review if they so desire. The procedure for submitting information varies between Departments: the Head of Department will offer the opportunity of a discussion meeting with the Assistant Professor and/or the Assistant Professor will be given the opportunity to submit a written statement about their work which the Head of Department will use in preparation of their statement to the Promotions Committee. This discussion 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 (for example, any significant periods of absence or if the candidate has a disability or chronic condition which has had a significant impact on their work), 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 1.6**. The Head of Department should give the Assistant Professor a reasonable period of notice in either case.

3. *Documentation submission by Head of Department*

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

For Interim Review candidates, if, after the consultations and consideration referred to above, the Head of Department is of the view that the Assistant Professor is not making the

required level of progress towards Major Review and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit for Interim Review has been reached the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee setting out the reasons and reporting on the Assistant Professor's progress and activities in research and publication, teaching, and service to the School. For those undergoing Interim Review, in addition to their statement, the Head of Department will be asked to suggest the names of external referees for the Promotions Committee's consideration using the relevant template form. 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 Assistant Professor pass Major Review with promotion to Associate Professor and there are either no reasons for deferral or the maximum time limit for Major Review has been reached the Head of Department will submit a full statement to the Promotions Committee setting out the reasons and reporting on the Assistant Professor's progress and activities as above.

4. *Additional information:*

If, in the period between the Head of Department submitting their statement and the Promotions Committee considering the case, any new information arises which the candidate/Head of Department wishes to be 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 Assistant Professor should pass their 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 Assistant Professor'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 Assistant Professor, or both, would benefit from the Promotions Committee having the possibility to consider the Assistant Professor's position again after the deferral (and so offering scope, where relevant, for any material coming into being during the period of the deferral to be considered by the Promotions Committee). The Promotions Committee may ask the VCAC to maintain a watching brief on progress.

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

Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

At the Major Review stage, the progress of an Assistant Professor will be considered in terms of the elements outlined in **Section 3.5**. Major Review is not a competitive exercise but an assessment of whether an individual should be promoted to the role of Associate Professor. The Promotions Committee will consider the Assistant Professor's contribution in its entirety, taking into account progress made since they passed Interim Review. If the Assistant Professor was appointed subject to Major Review only the Promotions Committee will consider the Assistant Professor's progress since their appointment at the School.

9.2 Consideration of Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor and Promotion Cases

Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Referees, the Departmental Assessor and External Experts, 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 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 (in the case of an Assistant Professor's Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor case) 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 and/or promotion cases will have one principal Internal Reader with a second member of the Committee appointed to each case in the role of 'Monitor'.

The purpose of the monitoring role is to ensure equity of treatment in the consideration of cases. The Monitor is provided with a full copy of the candidate's papers as listed in **Sections 3.5** and **3.7**. The Monitor does not read the candidate's submitted pieces as a matter of routine, although copies of writings are 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 they will also read the candidates' submitted writings.

Deferral of cases to a later meeting

Where, in the view of the Internal Reader / Monitor / Committee, a case is deemed to be either category 'C' or 'D' under the Promotions Committee grading scale or there is insufficient evidence to make a decision, a decision on the case may be deferred to the next meeting of the Promotions Committee to allow for further opinion(s) to be sought / further

information to be gathered. Where this occurs, the candidate and Head of Department will be informed of the adjustment in the timescale.

9.3 Consideration of Self-Sponsored Promotion Proposals

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

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

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

In all cases, Human Resources will write to the candidate's Head of Department requesting a full written statement about the work of the self-sponsored candidate. The Head of Department will be asked to state their opinion of the quality of the research and published output and to set out clearly and unambiguously the full range of opinions amongst the departmental professoriate. If the self-sponsored promotion proposal is submitted through the Head of Department, the Head of Department is free to submit their statement on the work of the candidate with the promotion documentation.

Before reaching a decision in each case the Promotions Committee will take account of the external opinions as expressed by the Departmental Assessor, External Experts and Referees, of the internal opinions as expressed in the promotion proposal, and the opinions of the Internal Reader and Internal Monitor assigned to assess the candidate's publications.

9.4 Procedure following Failure at Interim or Major Review

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

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

The hearing will be chaired by either the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) or another Pro-Director, with the VCAC, the Head of Department and HR Partner also present.

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

Right to Be Accompanied

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

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

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

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

Procedure

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

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

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

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

Right of Appeal

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

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

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

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

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

Procedure (1) [Emergency which arise in session]

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

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

advised therefore, to contact the VCAC in the first instance.

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

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

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

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

- A statement from the candidate's Head of Department reporting on the candidate's progress in research, teaching and contributions to the Department and the School
- A CV presented on the standard template including a statement from the candidate on their contributions to education, a research achievement record and a statement of planned research, and a contributions to citizenship statement.

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

Heads of Department should refer to the relevant sections of these Guidelines for further information on the headings to be addressed in the Head of Department's Statement (**Section 4.7**), criteria for selection of Referees (**Section 8.2**), roles of the Department Assessor and External Experts (**Section 8.3**), and writings (**Section 7**).

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

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

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

- Head of Department's Statement G/1
- Candidate's CV (including contributions to education statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and contributions to citizenship statement) G/2
- School student survey results
- Reports of two external Referees nominated by the Department
- Reports of the Departmental Assessor and External Experts nominated by the Department
- Report of the Internal Reader and Monitor (normally Promotions Committee members)

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

dates of the upcoming session please contact Human Resources).

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

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

10 DECISIONS OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE

10.1 Notification of Decisions

Decisions of the Promotions Committee remain confidential until candidates have been notified in writing of the outcome. Letters, copied to the Head of Department, will normally be issued within 10 working days following the conclusion of the meeting. Letters will normally be signed by the 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 an Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements for passing Interim Review, the Assistant Professor concerned will pass Interim Review.

Unsuccessful Interim Review

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

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

Successful Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that an Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements for passing Major Review, the Assistant Professor concerned will pass Major Review and will be promoted to the career grade of Associate Professor, normally from the following 1 August. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for Associate Professors.

Staff successful at Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor are free to seek promotion to Professor in the next round. Such candidates must keep in mind, however, that the Promotions Committee normally expects candidates to submit four publications and that, unless in exceptional circumstances, none of these can be the ones that were submitted for the Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor application.

Unsuccessful Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

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

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

Successful Promotion

If a majority of the members of the Promotions Committee is of the view that a post-Major Review Lecturer / Assistant Professor fulfils the requirements for promotion to Associate Professor, the staff member concerned will be promoted to the career grade of Associate Professor, normally from the following 1 August. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for Associate Professors.

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

will be promoted to the career grade of Professor, normally from the following 1 August. Staff will be issued with the role profile applicable for Professors.

Unsuccessful Promotion Applications

Unsuccessful candidates will be sent a personal letter setting out the reasons for the Promotions Committee's decision. Unsuccessful candidates are encouraged to seek a meeting with the Pro-Director (Faculty Development) in their capacity as Chair of the Promotions Committee or with the VCAC, to discuss their case. There is no right of appeal against decisions reached by the Promotions Committee on promotion to Professor cases (the same applies for promotion to Associate Professor for post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors). The candidate's Head of Department will also be informed of the reasons for the Committee's decision.

Waiting Period and Re-Applications

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

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

Reporting to the Appointments Committee

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

10.2 Salary Determination

Interim Review

Staff passing Interim Review will normally move to the minimum salary for post-Interim Review Assistant Professors, Step 41.5 to be paid from the following 1 August. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, they will normally be rewarded with one additional increment from the following 1 August.

Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor

Staff passing Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor will normally move to the minimum salary for Associate Professors, Step 45.5 to be paid from the following 1 August. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, they will normally be rewarded with one additional increment from the following 1 August.

Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only)

Post-Major Review Lecturers / Assistant Professors promoted to Associate Professor will normally move to the minimum salary for Associate Professors, Step 45.5 to be paid from the following 1 August. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, they will normally be rewarded with one additional increment from the following 1 August.

Promotion to Professor

Staff promoted to Professor will normally move to the minimum salary for Professors, Step 55.5, to be paid from the following 1 August. If a member of staff is already paid above this minimum, any increase in total pay will not be less than the value of three steps on the relevant professorial salary scales from the following 1 August.

Further information on the LSE salary scales is available on the Human Resources website.

PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: Terms of Reference and Membership

1. Purpose of Committee

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

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

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

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 and Promotions (including the award of Excellence in Education Prizes) as well as proposals put forward under the annual promotion round for research staff promotions to Associate Professorial Research Fellow, Professorial Research Fellow, Associate Professorial Lecturer and Professorial Lecturer, and to report annually to the Appointments Committee.
 - 3.2 To consider any issues referred to the Committee by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee concerning the individual progress of pre-Major Review staff; where appropriate, to consider and implement measures to monitor and provide support towards meeting School expectations for a successful outcome at Interim/Major Review.
 - 3.3 To have oversight of policy and procedures pertaining to the School's arrangements for promotion and review of academic staff (including promotion and review criteria) and research staff; to review and report annually to the Appointments Committee on the operation of these arrangements and to make recommendations as appropriate on developments or changes to policy and procedures.

- 3.4 To have oversight of equality and diversity issues in relation to the annual promotion and review round; to receive reports on the profile of promotion and review candidates by gender and ethnicity with a view to looking at potential inequalities and ensuring that School procedures do not discriminate. To make recommendations to the Appointments Committee as appropriate on equality and diversity issues in respect of promotion and review procedures.
- 3.5 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on policy issues relating to the recruitment and retention of academic staff.
- 3.6 To consider and make recommendations to the Appointments Committee on any issues referred by the Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee arising from the operation of the Career Development Review (CDR) Scheme.
- 3.7 To consider and make recommendations on any other policy matters or issues which have a direct bearing on its work that may be referred to it by the 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 they recuse themselves, the Pro-Director (Education) takes over as Chair. In case, they recuse themselves as well, the VCAC takes over as Chair.

7. Voting

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

MEMBERSHIP OF THE PROMOTIONS COMMITTEE: 2022-2023

Ex Officio	Pro-Director (Faculty Development) (Chair) Vice-Chair of Appointments Committee Pro Director (Education)	Professor Charles Stafford Professor Emily Jackson Professor Emma McCoy
GROUP 1	Accounting Finance Management	Professor Ricardo Alonso ² Professor Ian Martin ² Professor Christopher Polk ²
GROUP 2	European Institute Government International Development International Relations	Professor Tomila Lankina ¹ Professor Stephanie Rickard ² Professor Kai Spiekermann ¹
GROUP 3	Economics Mathematics Methodology Philosophy, Logic and Scientific Method Statistics	Professor Umut Cetin ² Professor Josef Skokan ¹ Professor Balazs Szentes ¹
GROUP 4	Anthropology Gender Studies Media and Communications Health Policy Psychological and Behavioural Science Social Policy Sociology	Professor Naila Kabeer ² Professor Coretta Phillips ² Professor Joan Costa Font ¹
GROUP 5	Economic History Geography and Environment International History Law	Professor Riccardo Crescenzi ² Professor Neil Duxbury ² Professor Leigh Gardner ¹

¹Serving first year of a two-year term, 2022-24

²Serving second year of a two-year term, 2021-23

Last updated 15 June 2022

PROMOTION AND REVIEW OF ACADEMIC STAFF: TIMETABLE FOR 2022-2023
--

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

Michaelmas Term:	Monday 26 September – Friday 9 December 2022
Mon 3 October 2022	Heads of Department's Deadline 1 (see Annex D for details)
Mon 24 October 2022	Heads of Department's Deadline 2 (see Annex D for details)
Wed 16 November 2022	<p>Promotions Committee (Schedule of Business)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considers Departmental External Experts / Assessor 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, External Experts and Referees 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
Lent Term:	Monday 16 January – Friday 31 March 2023
Wed 1 February 2023	<p>Promotions Committee (Interim Reviews)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Takes decisions on Interim Reviews of Assistant Professors ▪ Takes decisions on proposals for Promotion to Assistant Professorial Research Fellow
Tue 28 February, Wed 1 March, Thu 2 March & Wed 29 March 2023	<p>Promotions Committee (Major Review and Promotion cases)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Takes decisions on proposals for Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor, proposals for Promotion to Associate Professor (post-Major Review Lecturers/Assistant Professors only) and proposals for Promotion to Professor ▪ Takes decisions on promotions of research staff ▪ Takes decisions on promotions of Education Career Track staff <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:	Tuesday 2 May – Friday 16 June 2023
Wed 17 May 2023	<p>Promotions Committee (Annual Review)</p> <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 14 June 2023	<p>Appointments Committee (VCAC's Annual Report)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposals for changes to policy / procedure in respect of the annual academic promotion and review round, recommended by the Promotions Committee. ▪ A report on the general pattern of quality and procedures for academic appointments across and within the School.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO DEADLINES FOR REVIEW AND PROMOTION DOCUMENTATION
--

Departments must submit the documentation outlined below to Human Resources at:

hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

Case type	HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 3 October 2022)	HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 24 October 2022)
Department Documentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A final Departmental External Experts/ Assessor List • A Departmental Journals List (for note by PC) • Full list of candidates being put forward for the annual review and promotion process 	<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 educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 • Electronic copies of 2 writings*
Deferred Interim Review***	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/7 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing required
Major Review with Promotion to Associate Professor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement 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 • External Experts for Promotion G/5 • Departmental Teaching Observation G/6** • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Deferred Major Review***	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/7 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nothing required
Promotion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Referees for Promotion G/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department's Statement G/1 • External Experts for Promotion G/5 • Departmental Teaching Observation G/6** • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*
Self-sponsored Promotion (for candidates submitting their own documents, the HoD deadline applies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Referees for Promotion G/4 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department's Statement G/1 • External Experts for Promotion G/5 • Departmental Teaching Observation G/6** • Candidate's Statement G/9 • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*

Emergency Major Review or Promotion	<i>Until Human Resources receives the following, the process cannot commence:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Head of Department Statement G/1 • CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2 • Referees for Promotion G/4 • External Experts for Promotion G/5 • Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8
	<i>These documents must follow as soon as possible:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electronic copies of 4 writings* • Electronic copies of any book reviews*

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

** Optional

*** For deferrals from the 2022-23 academic session, documentation should be submitted as soon as possible and by no later than HoD Deadline 1. For deferrals from the 2023-24 academic session, documentation should be submitted by Monday 27 March 2023, in order for the Promotions Committee to be able to consider the request at its meeting to be held on 17 May 2023.

REFERENCE GUIDE TO PEER REVIEWERS (EXTERNAL & INTERNAL)

The Departmental External Experts/Assessor List to be submitted for the VCAC's review and Committee's approval by **HoD Deadline 1 (Monday 3 October 2022)**. All Referee nominations on Referees form G/4 and all nominations of External Experts for individual cases on the External Experts for Promotion form G/5 should be submitted by **HoD Deadline 2 (Monday 24 October 2022)**. All documentation to be sent electronically to hr.reviewandpromotion@lse.ac.uk

The Criteria for Selection of External Referees (**Section 8.2**) and External Experts/ Departmental Assessors (**Sections 8.3** and **8.4**) must be followed when making recommendations, any queries must be directed as soon as possible to the VCAC in the first instance.

	Interim Review	Major Review, Promotion to Associate Professor or Promotion to Professor	Self-Sponsored Promotion	Emergency Major Review or Promotion	Fee
3 x External Referee	-	Dept	VCAC	Dept	-
3 x External Referee	-	Cand	Cand	-	-
External Referee (Reserve)	-	Dept	VCAC	Dept	-
External Referee (Reserve)	-	Cand	Cand	Dept	-
External Expert	-	Dept	VCAC	Dept	£200 /candidate
External Expert	-	Cand	Cand	-	£200 /candidate
External Expert (Reserve)	-	Dept	VCAC	Dept	-
External Expert (Reserve)	-	Cand	Cand	-	-
Departmental Assessor	-	Dept	Dept	Dept	£250/year + £100/ candidate
Internal Reader	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	-
Monitor	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	VCAC	-
Eden Centre reports	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre	HR/Eden Centre	-

RECIPIENTS OF DOCUMENTATION WITHIN THE ACADEMIC REVIEW AND PROMOTION PROCESS

	Head of Department's Statement G/1	CV, including educational contribution statement, research trajectory & research achievement record, and citizenship contribution statement G/2	Departmental Teaching Observation G/6 (optional) and Eden Centre Teaching Observation (if requested)	Request to Defer Interim or Major Review G/7	Optional Declaration of Individual Circumstances G/8	Self-sponsored Candidate Statement G/9	Submitted Writings	Book Reviews	TQARO Student Survey Results	Referee Reports	External Expert Reports	Departmental Assessor Reports
Referees*		x					x					
External Experts*	x	x				x	x		x	x		
Departmental Assessors*	x	x				x	Upon request		x	x	x	
Promotions Committee (inc. Chair and Pro-Director, Education)	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
VCAC	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

*Not part of the Interim Review process