

# 14.01 Academic Staff Promotion Policy

<b>Document Type:</b>	Policy and Procedures
<b>Administering Entity:</b>	Human Resource Services
<b>Records Management System Number:</b>	D05/4930
<b>Date Approved by Vice-Chancellor:</b>	27 May 2009
<b>Indicative time for Review:</b>	Annually
<b>Responsibility for Review:</b>	Human Resource Services
<b>Related policies/documents:</b>	Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines – (05/5044)

## Overview

Promotion at the University of New England is on the basis of merit. In order that an individual be promoted, the Promotion Committee must be able to form the expectation, based on evidence provided by the applicant, assessors and supervisor that the applicant will be able to undertake the required duties of the level to which they aspire.

The University expects supervisors to consider ways to support the professional development of their staff. This includes providing advice, direction and mentoring in relation to promotion.

Staff, supervisors and Pro Vice-Chancellor and Deans are reminded of the University's expectation that they will act in a professional manner (see [Code of Conduct](#)).

The Vice-Chancellor has final approval of all recommendations for promotion from the Promotion Committees.

## Policy

### Eligibility

**14.01.1** All members of academic staff (including research-only staff and academic staff in support roles) holding full-time or fractional appointments, whether fixed term or continuing, are eligible to apply. Applicants are normally required to serve a minimum of twelve (12) months from appointment or promotion before seeking promotion. Exceptions may be made to this requirement with the approval of the appropriate Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean or Centre Director, and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor.

**14.01.2** Staff who have been unsuccessful in an application for promotion for two consecutive years are excluded from reapplying in the following year. An exception may be made by the appropriate Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean and Centre Director when a clearly improved case has the support of the supervisor and Head of School.

### Prior Consultation

**14.01.3** Staff members considering applying for promotion must discuss their readiness with their supervisor within four weeks of applications being called.

**14.01.4** Under special circumstances (e.g. a recent change in the Head of School or where the supervisor is applying for promotion to the same level as the

applicant) and after consultation with the applicant, the Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean may assign an alternative supervisor to a staff member applying for promotion.

**14.01.5** Staff members are required to make available to their supervisor the following documentation, prior to meeting with their supervisor:

- a summary of the case they intend to make for promotion;
- a bibliography;
- at least three Lecturer Teaching Performance evaluations over a range of years, including an evaluation from the most recent teaching year;
- teaching load for previous and current year.

Staff members are strongly encouraged to provide a copy of their most recent Performance Planning and Review report.

**14.01.6** Supervisors should provide confidential advice to staff considering promotion, including a realistic assessment of their prospects for promotion and guidance on how to prepare an application.

**14.01.7** Each year supervisors must attend the information session held for supervisors of applicants.

**14.01.8** Where the supervisor is not the Head of School, he/she will meet with the Head of School to discuss potential applicants and the strength of the indicative case(s) for promotion.

**14.01.9** Where an application is considered to be premature, the supervisor will provide advice to assist in a future application and develop an action plan with the staff member, in accordance with clause 15.02.30 of the Performance Planning and Review Policy.

**14.01.10** The decision to make an application rests with the staff member.

### **Criteria**

**14.01.11** While the Committee will consider the applicant's whole career, achievements since appointment or last promotion at UNE will be the primary determinant of promotion.

**14.01.12** Required minimum duties for each level are set out in the University's Position Classification Standards for academic and research-only academic staff (see also clause 14.01.21 for academic staff in support roles). The Position Classification Standards provide an outline of the qualifications and experience, typical duties and level of contribution expected at each academic level.

**14.01.13** Many of the duties are common to each level, but as the staff member advances in his/her career, the duties are expected to be performed at higher levels and with increasing demonstration of leadership.

**14.01.14** The expectation of a fractional position will be that fraction of the work of a full-time position.

**14.01.15** To be promoted, an applicant must present a compelling case, with appropriate supporting evidence, of his/her capacity to perform at the level to which they aspire.

**14.01.16** Promotion Committees will assess:

- the applicant's formal qualifications or progress towards such qualifications (if applicable);
- experience and achievement in teaching and curriculum development, including leadership in teaching (as appropriate for the level of the applicant and to opportunities available);
- research, scholarship, creative achievement and professional activity (as appropriate for the level of the applicant and to opportunities available); and
- service to the University and to the community (as appropriate for the level of the applicant and to opportunities available).

### **Experience and Achievement in Teaching and Curriculum Development, including Leadership in Teaching**

**14.01.17** In assessing experience and achievement in teaching, curriculum development and contribution to student learning, the Committee requires evidence of high quality performance. It is expected that applicants will explain their approach and contributions to teaching and curriculum development. Data from a variety of sources, together with appropriate explanation and interpretation must be provided.

**14.01.18** The Committee will consider all evidence of merit in teaching provided in the application. Candidates should contemplate providing evidence in the form of:

- supervision of honours and undergraduate students;
- successful and timely supervision of postgraduate students;
- high quality teaching material presented to students;
- initiative in practical work, field work and placement of students in work experience;
- leadership in teaching, curriculum development and contribution to student learning (especially for levels D and E applicants);
- initiative and innovation in teaching delivery and curriculum design and student engagement;
- coordination, development, review and management of units and/or awards (as appropriate for the level of the applicant and to opportunities available);
- teaching performance and contribution to student learning recognised through awards or fellowships;
- attracting teaching improvement grants;
- strategies implemented, and/or development activities undertaken, to improve learning outcomes for students;

- invited presentations on teaching to scholarly meetings, conferences or other peer groups;
- where appropriate, leadership within a course, School or Faculty to enhance the quality of student learning outcomes at a wider level than through the applicant's own teaching;
- strategies that demonstrate the successful engagement of relevant professional and/or community bodies that enhance the marketability of the course and/or teaching outcomes; and/or
- a description of team projects, including an explanation of the relative contribution of the applicant in relation to other team members.

**14.01.19** Applicants are required to provide evidence of teaching merit in the form of at least three reports of student evaluations over a range of years, including an evaluation from the most recent teaching year. Where the applicant is not the Unit Co-ordinator, justification for including Student Feedback on Unit evaluations should be presented. Where an applicant has been involved in both on and off campus teaching, results from both must be provided.

**14.01.20** An exemption to this requirement may be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor where Planning and Institutional Research indicates that it would have been impossible to obtain this data. In such cases, this must be clearly explained and the applicant must still provide convincing independent evidence of performance and effectiveness.

**14.01.21** Academic staff employed in academic support roles in Schools, Faculties or support groups such as the Teaching and Learning Centre and the Oorala Centre are required to demonstrate high quality performance in teaching, curriculum development and contributions to learning. It is recognised that the duties of such staff may differ significantly from 'teaching and research' staff. In such cases, the Committee will consider evidence of merit in activities relevant to the responsibilities of the individual, such as:

- contributions to academic professional development programs, seminars and workshops for staff;
- contributions to academic, teaching and course development activities;
- advising, mentoring and counselling staff; and
- advising, mentoring and counselling students;

as well as the examples listed earlier in 14.01.18. Because the duties of the individual may not include formal student teaching, it may not be possible to provide results of lecturer teaching performance evaluations or student feedback on units. In such cases, this must be clearly explained and the applicant must still provide convincing independent evidence of performance and effectiveness.

**14.01.22** It is incumbent upon the applicant to provide evidence on the extent and quality of his/her teaching, curriculum development and contribution to student learning. In addition to student evaluations, this may include peer reviews, qualitative comments (including an analysis of how the applicant

has responded to student feedback), unsolicited letters of acknowledgement or impact, and letters acknowledging receipt of teaching grants and awards.

## **Research, Scholarship, Creative Achievement and Professional Activity**

**14.01.23** In assessing an applicant's research, scholarship, creative achievement and professional activity the Committee will consider evidence of merit and research impact through, for example:

- joint or sole authorship of books, chapters in books, review of state of the art articles, publications in refereed journals, and other articles, papers and published conference proceedings in any medium. Regard will be given to the international status of the publication and the role of reviewers in its assessment as well as to the disciplinary context in which the outcome was produced;
- editorship of refereed scholarly journals;
- patents, inventions or other innovation outcomes from research;
- reviews of publications;
- joint or sole authorship, direction or execution of activities such as performances, productions, exhibitions or designs appropriate to the discipline concerned, particularly with regard to the international status of the work and the role of reviewers in its assessment, or any other creative achievement;
- academic leadership (especially for levels D and E applicants), including leadership in research centres, CRCs and other research-focused groups or organisations;
- professional practice achievements acknowledged by appropriate peer, industry or client recognition;
- attracting competitive external research grants;
- attracting non-competitive industry and other grants and/or research consultancy income that generate clear outcomes and/or evidence of impact;
- evidence of participation in/development of research partnerships or relationships with groups/organisations/universities outside of UNE that have yielded demonstrable outcomes;
- research performance recognised through awards or fellowships;
- involvement in consultancy work in terms of its contribution to the advancement of knowledge and/or its application to professional practice, including consultancy reports and presentations. Evidence that the applicant has met conditions under the 'Paid Outside Work' policy must be provided;
- contributions of a scholarly kind to the affairs of a professional organisation or a learned society;
- invited addresses or presentations to scholarly or professional meetings and conferences;
- experience as an examiner or editor/reviewer for academic/professional journals or publishers (as appropriate for the level of the applicant and to opportunities available) and/or

- evidence of research or innovation impact, including evaluation or impact assessments, media stories or press releases about research impacts or outcomes or other indicators of research impact or innovation adoption.

**14.01.24** Consistent with the current Commonwealth Government emphasis on research excellence via the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) policy, applicants must demonstrate excellence in the quality of their publications. Applicants must indicate and describe their most significant publications (up to ten), including percentage contribution, citation or other bibliometric analysis, journal ranking and impact factor, where available. Note that the application must clearly distinguish between published work and work that is in press (accepted for publication but not yet published).

**14.01.25** It is incumbent on the applicant to provide evidence on important research outcomes, impact and/or innovation adoption (for example, published reviews of books or other creative works, status of book publishers, letters confirming award of grants, letters of invitation or statement of specific contribution).

**14.01.26** Applicants must set out a case for including specific types of professional activity under this criterion rather than under the service criterion.

### **Service to the University and to the Community**

**14.01.27** In assessing service to the University and to the community, the Committee will consider merit in areas related to the applicant's role as a UNE academic, such as:

- policy formation at discipline/school/centre/faculty, and/or University level;
- contributions to the University community and professional, private and public organisations, which are not listed under 14.01.23 and are consistent with the applicant's areas of expertise, or deemed by the applicant to be significant;
- leadership in service (especially for levels D and E applicants);
- the initiation or maintenance of links between the University and external groups such as employers, graduates, professional organisations, government organisations and the community at large; and/or
- enhancement of public appreciation of the University through a variety of electronic, print, performance and other media.

**14.01.28** It is incumbent upon the applicant to provide evidence on the quality of service to support his/her case for promotion. Applicants are advised that the focus must be on merit and not merely on the length of service. Documentary evidence may include, for example, letters of invitation or acknowledgement of contribution, detailing specific contributions and outcomes from Committee participation and other University and community roles, evidence of impact in the University and wider community as a result of service contributions.

## Weightings

**14.01.29** Applicants must specify the weighting that they wish the Committee to ascribe to the three criteria. The range of weightings which can be applied are shown below. The total of the weightings must equal 100%.

### For Promotion to Levels B, C, D and E (Academic) (except Research-only)

Criteria	Weighting Range (%)			
	B	C	D	E
Experience and achievement in teaching and curriculum development (relative to opportunities and constraints)	30 – 60	30 – 60	30 – 60	20 – 50
Research, scholarship, creative achievement and professional activity	30 – 60	30 – 60	30 – 60	40 – 70
*Service to the University and the community (relative to opportunities and constraints)	10 – 30	10 – 30	10 – 30	10 – 40

\*Where a staff member has held a substantive administrative position of at least 50%, such as a Head of School or Associate Dean/Academic Director/Research Director for a minimum of twelve consecutive months, they may nominate an appropriate weighting outside the above ranges and present a case justifying the weighting chosen.

### For Promotion to Levels B, C, D and E (Research-only)

Criteria	Weighting Range (%)			
	B	C	D	E
Experience and achievement in teaching and curriculum development (relative to opportunities and constraints)	0 - 10	0 - 15	0 - 20	0 - 20
Research, scholarship, creative achievement and professional activity	80-100	75-100	70-100	70-100
Service to the University and the community (relative to opportunities and constraints)	0 - 10	0 - 10	0 - 10	0 - 10

## Assessors

**14.01.30** The Head of School shall select assessors for each application as set out in the table below. Where the Head of School is not the supervisor, he/she shall consult with the supervisor.

**14.01.31**

Level	No. Nominated by	No. selected by Head of	Total

	<b>Applicant</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>Required</b>
B	5 (at least 2 external to UNE)	2 (at least 1 external to UNE)	2
C	5 (at least 2 external to UNE)	2 (at least 1 external to UNE)	2
D	6 (at least 3 external to UNE)	3 (at least 2 external to UNE)	3
E	7 (at least 3 external to UNE)	4 (at least 2 external to UNE)	4

**14.01.32** Applicants will provide the Head of School with a list of potential assessors who are able to comment competently on claims made in the application. Where the Head of School is not satisfied with the list he/she will indicate those not approved and attach a report containing the rationale. In nominating replacement assessors, he/she will seek the advice of one to three senior colleagues and discuss the alternatives with the applicant. The Head of School shall select assessors from this pool and will obtain agreement from each assessor to provide a report by the date specified by Human Resource Services (HRS).

**14.01.33** The applicant will not be given any indication of the final assessors chosen and must not communicate with any nominee on the list, with respect to his/her promotion application.

**14.01.34** HRS will provide all assessors with an electronic copy of the application.

### Reports on the Application

**14.01.35** On receipt of the completed application, the supervisor must consult between one and three senior colleagues prior to completing the supervisor's report form. The senior colleagues consulted will be, where possible, familiar with the applicant and their work and must be at or above the level to which the applicant is applying to be promoted.

**14.01.36** The report should indicate clearly whether, in his/her professional judgement, he/she supports the application for promotion. The report must include:

- Specific and detailed comments on the applicant's record and quality of performance in the context of the specified criteria. The supervisor must:
  - comment on the status and quality of journals, publications and creative and artistic works;
  - where possible and defensible, indicate disciplinary (and sub-disciplinary) publication norms relevant to the level sought; and
  - indicate disciplinary and School norms in regard to grant income, teaching load and service, relevant to the level sought.

Where this information is not known the supervisor must seek the advice of senior colleagues in the discipline.

- Confirmation that between one and three senior colleagues in the discipline or related discipline at UNE were consulted and the capacity in which they were consulted.
  - Signature of the supervisor and between one and three senior colleagues (subject to clause 14.01.37).
- 14.01.37** If the senior colleagues do not agree with the supervisor's report, or have any comments they consider should have been included in the report, they may include an additional report, which is to be presented to the supervisor. Any such reports must be submitted with the supervisor's report.
- 14.01.38** Except with the consent of the applicant, the supervisor is not to disclose any information contained in the application to other members of the School/Centre. However, by submitting a promotion application, applicants are deemed to give permission for their supervisor to consult relevant senior colleagues in the preparation of the report and provide them with a copy of the relevant application.
- 14.01.39** The supervisor, in preparing his/her report on an applicant, must not consult with an applicant's assessor.
- 14.01.40** Any senior colleague consulted by the supervisor may not be an assessor for the applicant.
- 14.01.41** Where the applicant is undertaking a service role (e.g., Associate Dean/Academic Director/Research Director) that is explicitly defined as a proportion of the applicant's workload, two supervisors' reports must be provided: one addressing the applicant's performance in the service role and one addressing the applicant's performance in the other role. Each report will indicate the percentage of the applicant's workload in the role.
- 14.01.42** Where the Head of School is not the supervisor, he/she will read and sign the supervisor's report.
- 14.01.43** Where a Pro Vice-Chancellor is the applicant's direct supervisor, he/she will be excluded from Committee deliberations for that applicant.
- 14.01.44** Where an applicant's appointment is to a Centre outside a Faculty, the supervisor will be a senior colleague or the Centre Director.
- 14.01.45** The applicant must then sign that he/she has seen the supervisor's and senior colleagues' report(s). The applicant has the right to write a report rebutting material contained in any report.
- 14.01.46** Members of the Promotion Committee which will consider the applicant's case or assessors must not act as a senior colleague during the preparation of the supervisor's report on that application. Breach of this rule will result in the exclusion of that Committee member from the Committee's deliberations for that particular applicant.

### Promotion Committee

- 14.01.47** The Promotion Committee will consist of:
- Vice-Chancellor (Chair and member – Level E only)

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Chair, Levels B, C, D and member, Level E)
- Faculty Pro Vice-Chancellors and Dean
- Chair or Deputy Chair of the Academic Board
- Four continuing academics (two elected from each Faculty, one at Level C or above and one at Level D or above.)
- One External Professor (not necessarily the same for each level)
- For research-only staff the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) will be a member.

The quorum for the Committee will be six.

- 14.01.48** The Chair of the Promotion Committee, following consultation with the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean, may replace a member of the Committee who, due to illness, resignation or other exceptional circumstance, is unable to participate. Where the member holds an elected position, the runner-up will normally be a reserve. If there is no runner-up in an election, the Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean shall nominate a reserve.
- 14.01.49** An elected academic staff representative and the Employment Equity and Diversity Officer, or nominee, will be present as observers at all Promotion Committee meetings.
- 14.01.50** The role of observers is to monitor the Committee's process and comment on any problems or difficulties they observe. Observers do not have a vote.
- 14.01.51** The Chair of each Committee will ensure that there is an appropriate gender balance and will have the delegation to co-opt additional members to effect this.
- 14.01.52** To ensure continuity, elected members would normally be elected for a two-year term, with half the elected members retiring each year.
- 14.01.53** Where an applicant perceives that a conflict of interest or personal grievance exists between themselves and a Committee member, they must raise the matter in writing with the Chair of the Committee directly or through the Employment Equity and Diversity Officer at least two weeks prior to the meeting date. The Chair, after discussion with all parties, may then request the Committee member to absent him/herself from discussing and voting on that applicant's case.
- 14.01.54** Any Committee member must declare a conflict of interest involving themselves and the applicant and absent themselves from the discussion of that applicant.
- 14.01.55** In the event that insufficient nominations for election arise for a member from a Faculty (see clause 14.01.47) the relevant Pro Vice-Chancellor and Dean will appoint a member.
- 14.01.56** The membership of the Promotion Committees, including reserves, will be published on the HRS website prior to close of applications.

## Appeal Procedures

**14.01.57** Appeals may be lodged only on the grounds of a significant breach of procedure, provided it can be demonstrated that such a breach may have affected the outcome of the application. The academic merits of a case for promotion and the judgement of the Committee may not be used as a basis for an appeal.

**14.01.58** Examples of procedural grounds include, but are not limited to, the following:

- that the Promotion Committee was not properly constituted;
- that the Promotion Committee failed to follow the procedures set out in this Policy in a manner which, in the opinion of the Promotion Appeals Committee, affects its decision on the application;
- that the Promotion Committee failed to apply the prescribed criteria or failed to consider all appropriate documentation available to it;
- that there was a reasonable apprehension that a member of the Promotion Committee may have exhibited bias against an applicant.

**14.01.59** An appeal must be lodged with HRS within 15 working days of the date on the letter providing the feedback from the Promotions Committee.

**14.01.60** The Promotion Appeals Committee will comprise:

- a Professor nominated by the Vice-Chancellor (Chair); and
- two Professors or Associate Professors, not necessarily members of Academic Board, appointed by the Standing Committee of Academic Board.

Each of the three members will have served on previous promotion committees. They must not have been involved in any aspect of the applicant's case to be reviewed. To avoid conflicts of interest, the appointments will be made on the advice of HRS in light of the particular appeal cases under review.

**14.01.61** The Promotion Appeals Committee will be provided with the following documentation for its consideration:

- the Academic Staff Promotion Policy and Guidelines
- the appeal submission;
- the application, supervisor's and assessors' reports;
- feedback from the Committee;
- a report from the Chair of the Promotions Committee on the alleged breach of procedure. Such a report will address closely and specifically each issue raised by the appellant.

**14.01.62** The Committee may obtain and consider any other material which, in its opinion, is relevant. The Committee can make one of the following two decisions:

- that no breach of procedure has occurred - recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that the appeal be dismissed, or

- that a breach of procedure has occurred – recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that the appeal be upheld.

Such a recommendation will be accompanied by advice and draft instructions to the Review Committee for the Vice-Chancellor's consideration.

**14.01.63** Where an appeal is upheld, the application will be referred to a Promotion Review Committee.

**14.01.64** There will be no appeal beyond the Vice-Chancellor's decision regarding the recommendation from the Promotion Appeals Committee.

**14.01.65** The Vice-Chancellor will provide feedback to the Chair of the Promotion Committee on the outcome of an appeal.

**14.01.66** The Promotion Review Committee will comprise:

- two Professors or Associate Professors from each Faculty appointed by the Vice-Chancellor, one of whom will be a Professor nominated as Chair.

Where an appellant is applying for Level E, the Committee will comprise four Professors.

**14.01.67** Each of the four members will normally have served on promotion committees at least once during the past four years. They must not have been involved in any aspect of the applicant's case to be reviewed. To avoid conflicts of interest, the appointments will be made on the advice of HRS in light of the particular appeal cases under review.

**14.01.68** An elected academic staff representative and the Employment Equity and Diversity Officer or nominee, will be present as observers at the Promotion Appeals and Review Committee meetings.

**14.01.69** The Chair of each Committee will ensure that there is an appropriate gender balance and will have the delegation to co-opt additional members to effect this, while meeting the criteria specified in clauses 14.01.60 and 14.01.66.

**14.01.70** The Promotion Review Committee will be provided with the following documentation and will assess the whole application (see clauses 14.01.87 to 14.01.93):

- The Academic Staff Promotion Policy and Guidelines
- The application, supervisor's and assessors' reports;
- Instruction from the Vice-Chancellor.

**14.01.71** After discussion, a vote will be taken by show of hands as to whether or not to recommend promotion in light of the upheld appeal and Committee discussion. A minimum of three affirmative votes will determine a recommendation to promote. The Promotion Review Committee will make its recommendation directly to the Vice-Chancellor.

**14.01.72** There will be no appeal beyond the Vice-Chancellor's decision regarding the recommendation from a Promotion Review Committee.

- 14.01.73** The Vice-Chancellor will advise the Chair of the relevant Promotion Committee of the outcome of the Promotion Review.

## Procedures

- 14.01.74** Applications for promotion will be called for at least twelve weeks before the closing date. Whilst specific dates may vary from year to year, the University will strive to adhere to the following calendar:
- Call for applications to be made no later than July of each year,
  - Promotion Committees will meet between September and November of each year.
- 14.01.75** Applications must be made on the Application for Promotion Form [14.01a](#) and must be complete and self contained. The application must not exceed 30 pages and must be presented in the prescribed format (see [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines](#)).
- 14.01.76** Where the inclusion of evidence would result in exceeding the page limit, applicants should show the relevant documentation to the supervisor for verification.
- 14.01.77** Applicants must submit the completed application, to their supervisor and HRS, by the nominated closing date.
- 14.01.78** The Head of School will email the final list of assessors to HRS on the application closing date.
- 14.01.79** On completion of the supervisor's report, where the supervisor is not the Head of School, he/she will forward it to the Head of School for signing, together with any senior colleagues' reports.
- 14.01.80** The supervisor will arrange for the applicant to sign that he/she has seen the supervisor's and any senior colleagues' report(s).
- 14.01.81** The supervisor must then email a pdf of the supervisor's and any senior colleagues' report(s), with all relevant signatures, direct to the Secretary of the Promotion Committee in HRS by the closing date.
- 14.01.82** The applicant may submit a rebuttal of an adverse comment contained in a supervisor's report, or a senior colleague's report, within five working days of signing the supervisor's report. A copy of such a rebuttal must be provided to the supervisor, Head of School, and senior colleague (if appropriate).
- 14.01.83** Following the receipt of applications, HRS will seek assessors' reports.
- 14.01.84** HRS will provide applications, supervisors' and assessors' reports, any rebuttals and, where relevant, feedback from previous unsuccessful attempts for promotion to the relevant level to Committee members and observers.
- 14.01.85** Up until 10 working days prior to the advertised meeting of the Committee applicants may provide additional information relevant to his/her application, such as update of publications, teaching evaluations, and other achievements. Additional information must be emailed in pdf to HRS and must not exceed two pages.

**14.01.86** An applicant has the right to withdraw an application.

### Committee Processes

**14.01.87** Prior to the meeting of the Committee, members and observers may seek, through the Chair, confirmation from the supervisor of a matter of fact included in an application. In exceptional circumstances the Chair may seek, on behalf of the Committee, clarification of a matter of fact, during a meeting. However, it should be noted that it is incumbent on the applicant to provide all the necessary documentation.

**14.01.88** Before commencement of any discussion of the criteria, the Chair will provide a brief summary of the application, including the applicant's nominated weighting for each criterion, feedback from an unsuccessful application, nature of fractional appointments and any career interruptions. The Committee will consider each applicant's case for each of the three criteria independently. The applicant's case will be rated separately and secretly on each criterion.

**14.01.89** Each Committee member will be asked to assign the rating between 1 and 10 that best represents his/her assessment of the applicant's position with respect to the criterion being discussed.

9-10	Compelling case for promotion
7-8	Evidence of strength providing a worthy case for consideration
5-6	Evidence of strength in a number of areas but not sufficient to achieve promotion
3-4	Insufficient case at this point in time
1-2	Weak case for promotion falling well short of what is required

**14.01.90** The goal for discussion of each criterion in turn is for the members to achieve a clear understanding of the applicant's case for promotion. The discussion will consider any feedback from prior unsuccessful promotion attempts for the current level sought.

**14.01.91** After discussion of each criterion has concluded, Committee members will anonymously record his/her rating on a single recording sheet. The recording sheets will then be collected and ratings entered into a spreadsheet and the nominated weights applied.

**14.01.92** The individual and average ratings for each criterion area, the weighted scores for each Committee member and the overall average weighted score will be electronically displayed to the Committee. Each member will then vote either 'Yes' to recommend promotion or 'No' to not recommend promotion and display his/her vote simultaneously to the Committee on the call from the Chair. Where the number of votes results in the case for promotion being borderline (see 14.01.95) the Chair will call for further discussion and allow any member of the Committee to change his/her vote. Abstentions are not permitted.

- 14.01.93** The feedback to be given to an unsuccessful applicant will be discussed by the Committee before moving to the next applicant. Such feedback will be signed off by the Chair before being provided to the applicant.
- 14.01.94** After considering all applications, the Committee will review its decision on each application to ensure that an equal benchmark has been applied to all applications.
- 14.01.95** An applicant will be recommended to the Vice-Chancellor for promotion by the Promotion Committee if his/her application receives support of two-thirds of the Committee membership.

Number of Committee members	Number of votes required for promotion
6	4
7	5
8	5
9	6
10	7
11	7
12	8

### Notification of Outcome

- 14.01.96** All applicants will be advised in writing of the outcome of their application. In the event of an unsuccessful application, a report from the Chair of the Committee giving the reasons for the Committee's decision not to promote will be provided. This report will include the Committee's score and descriptor for each criterion and the overall weighted score. The report will highlight both the strengths and the weaknesses of the application with a view to building a constructive platform for future applications.
- 14.01.97** To assist applicants in addressing the feedback provided by the Committee, supervisors will meet with unsuccessful applicants to develop an action plan, in accordance with the Performance Development and Review Policy.
- 14.01.98** Unsuccessful applicants may request to meet with the Chair of the Promotion Committee and the Chair or Deputy Chair of the Academic Board who served on the relevant promotion committee. The applicant's supervisor, or any other person nominated by the applicant, may be present. The purpose of such a meeting will be to provide guidance for future applications. Discussion at this meeting may not be used as grounds for appeal. Explicit advice as to when the applicant should next apply for promotion will not be provided.

**Further Information:** Human Resource Services, ext. 3612, email: [mmcclena@une.edu.au](mailto:mmcclena@une.edu.au)