

Academic Progression Committee Guidance

1. Purpose

Personal Development Review (PDR) is the University's process for all permanent and fixed-term staff, to review individual contribution, discuss career aspirations and develop our staff. The PDR process will inform readiness for Academic Progression through the ongoing conversations that take place between Reviewer and Reviewee throughout the year. The Academic Progression Committees will review, as appropriate, applications for confirmation in post, and progression to Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor (Ranges 1 – 4, and professorial incremental progression). The Academic Progression Committees will assess all applications against the relevant Academic Profile.

2. Academic Progression Criteria

For the purposes of progression staff are expected to meet the Academic Profile for their current grade and demonstrate readiness to progress to the next grade.

It is therefore not expected that staff will be performing across all areas for the higher grade, they should however demonstrate evidence of a clear and continuing trajectory against the core criteria identified in the Academic Profile for which they are applying.

3. Assessing Applications

Applications should be evaluated holistically, with overall contributions across the three domains of Research/Scholarship, Teaching and Learning and Citizenship being taken into account. Compensation across and within domains should be applied, for example, outstanding contribution in one domain may compensate for lower levels of contribution in another domain. There is flexibility to allow for roles with differing degrees of emphasis on research & scholarship, teaching & learning, and citizenship. An applicant will not necessarily need to show an equally high level of achievement in each of the areas of activity, but if not, then compensatory achievement in some other area of activity is required.

All cases for progression will be assessed in relation to the norms of the discipline within which the candidate works.

The types of evidence listed in the Profiles are exemplars of activities in which applicants may be involved. They are not a checklist nor are they exhaustive; applicants may present other types of evidence to show how they meet the criteria.

It is essential that applicants provide information in relation to teaching evaluations to demonstrate the quality of their teaching. Instead of the exclusive use of a fixed threshold value of TEQ (previously 4.0), other measures should be considered to appropriately measure teaching performance. In particular, cognisance should be given to the disciplinary/module norm TEQ, the comments of the PDR Reviewer. It will be important to assess the trajectory of TEQ scores over the probationary period and whether (or not) the applicant has been given sufficient opportunities to teach on the same module for Probationers.

The Academic Progression Committees should assess the *quality of the contribution* in the different areas of activity or roles undertaken, not just the *quantity of activity*.

4. Key Roles

Committee Chair Role

The Committee Chair will ensure an agenda is shared with the Committee prior to the meeting, and at the beginning of the meeting, will establish the ground rules for the meeting, reminding the Committee to consider equality and diversity (see Mitigating Circumstances) and unconscious bias issues. The Committee Chair will facilitate discussion, and ensure that everyone has an opportunity to voice their opinion. The Committee Chair will help the Committee to work towards a consensus, to provide relevant contextual information where necessary, and for ensuring decisions are reached. The Committee Chair will be responsible for ensuring the rationale for decisions taken by the Committee is clearly documented.

Committee Members Role

Committee members will discuss each application, applying the criteria as per the relevant Academic Profile, reaching a consensus on each application.

Committee members are personally responsible for disclosing potential conflicts of interest to the Committee Chair and HR Business Partner. For particular applications, they may need to leave the room as the other Committee members discuss and decide the outcome.

5. The Committee Meeting

5.1. In advance of the meeting:

- each Committee member should familiarise themselves with the relevant Academic Profiles, and review each application against the relevant Profile for which the applicant is applying. Applications will be available to access on QOL;
- if not available uploaded to QOL, the Head of School will ensure the PDR Summary Reports and Peer Observer Reports (probationers only) are distributed to all Committee members ahead of the review meeting
- Committee members are required to complete the University's Unconscious Bias training;
- the Committee Chair will ensure an agenda is shared with the Committee prior to the meeting.

5.2. The Committee Chair will establish the ground rules for the meeting, and remind the Committee to consider equality and diversity (see Mitigating Circumstances) aims. The Committee will agree at the outset the types of evidence required in relation to the aspects of each Profile.

5.3. The PDR Reviewer will be invited to discuss their submitted Summary Reports and will leave the meeting when this is finished.

5.4. The Committee Chair making a recommendation will be asked to attend the Committee where the final decision is being made, to discuss the recommendation rationale.¹

¹ The Chair of the School Academic Progression Committee will be asked to discuss the rationale for the recommendation for progression to Reader.

The Chair of the Faculty Academic Progression Committee will be invited to attend the Central Academic Progression Committee to discuss the rationale for the recommendation for Professorial progression.

- 5.5. The Committee Chair will facilitate discussion, and ensure that everyone has an opportunity to voice their opinion. The representative from another School within the Faculty will play an important role in ensuring the Profile criteria is applied consistency across the Faculty.
- 5.6. Committee members will discuss each application and the Committee Chair will help the Committee to work towards a consensus, to provide relevant contextual information where necessary, and for ensuring decisions are reached.
- 5.7. Where the Committee determines that an applicant best meets a different grade profile it reserves the right to recommend/offer progression to a grade different from that for which application was originally made.
- 5.8. At the end of the meeting the Committee Chair will be responsible for calibrating the decisions, ensuring a consistent approach has been applied throughout. They will also ensure the rationale for decisions taken by the Committee is clearly documented.
- 5.9. Following the meeting the Committee Chair will ensure QOL is updated accordingly, confirming:
 - successful/unsuccessful applicants
 - recommendations for progression to Reader (School Committee)
 - recommendations for progression to Professor (Faculty Committee)

Applicants will receive formal written feedback, or confirmation of progression, from the Committee Chair. People and Culture will produce template letters for the Committee Chair to include any specific development actions to be addressed.

6. Queens Online (QOL)

If you do not have access to QOL or require assistance in accessing the documents, please speak to your School/Faculty Administrator in the first instance. Please see Appendix 2 for guidance on navigating QOL.

7. Mitigating Circumstances

The University recognises that there may be individual circumstances which have impacted on an individual's contribution as judged against the progression criteria. The committees will give due consideration to any individual circumstances when making their evaluation of an individual progression application.

The Committees should consider the application, focusing on the quality of outcomes, and having regard to the individual circumstances and nature and duration of absence.

8. Further Guidance

Full guidance on the new progression process can be found at: [Academic Progression](#)

Any question should be directed to either the Committee Chair or your HR Business Partner, in the first instance.

Academic Progression Committee Decision Making Responsibility

Level	Recommendation	Decision	Committee Membership	Documents to Review	Appeal
Lecturer on Probation	-	School Academic Progression Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of School (Chair) Director of Education Director of Research Swan representative Senior colleague from another School HR Business Partner Discipline/subject lead (relevant Discipline only) PDR Reviewer in attendance to discuss Summary Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's Academic CV the applicant's Cover Letter PDR Summary Report Peer Review of Teaching Report 	Faculty Progression Committee (Appeal letter to: Faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellor)
Senior Lecturer	-	School Academic Progression Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Head of School (Chair) Director of Education Director of Research Swan representative Senior colleague from another School HR Business Partner Discipline/ subject lead (relevant Discipline only) PDR Reviewer in attendance to discuss Summary Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's Academic CV the applicant's Cover Letter PDR Summary Report 	Central Academic Progression Appeal Panel (Appeal letter to People and Culture Director)
Reader	School Committee	Faculty Academic Progression Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Chair) Faculty Deans of Research and Education Faculty Heads of School HR Business Partner PDR Reviewer in attendance to discuss Summary Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's Academic CV the applicant's Cover Letter the PDR Summary Report the School Academic Progression Committee recommendation 	Central Academic Progression Appeal Panel (Appeal letter to People and Culture Director)
Professor	Faculty Committee	Central Academic Progression Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vice-Chancellor (Chair) Registrar and Chief Operating Officer PVC Research, Enterprise and Postgraduate Affairs PVC Education and Students Head of Organisational Development Representation from Faculty Academic Progression Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's Academic CV the applicant's Cover Letter the PDR Summary Report the Faculty Academic Progression Committee recommendation 	Central Academic Progression Appeal Panel (Appeal letter to People and Culture Director)
Senior Lecturer, Reader and Professor Appeals	-	Central Academic Progression Appeal Panel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Internationalisation and Engagement (Chair) People and Culture Director Director of QGI Member of the Professoriate Lay member of Senate Representation from School/Faculty Academic Progression Committee Chair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the applicant's Academic CV the applicant's Cover Letter the PDR Summary Report the School/ Faculty Academic Progression Committee recommendation/ decision rationale (as appropriate) the Central Academic Progression Committee decision rationale appeal documentation 	-