Name of Procedure	**Academic Promotions: Application Procedures**
Governing Policy	Academic Promotions Policy
Description of Procedure	This procedure provides guidance to Academic Staff and the Academic Promotions Committee on the academic promotions process.
Procedure applies to	☒ University-wide ☐ Specific *(outline location, campus, organisational unit, etc)*
	☒ Staff only ☐ Students only ☐ Staff and students
Procedure status	☐ New policy ☒ Revision of existing policy

Approval authority	Vice-Chancellor and President
Governing authority	Provost
Responsible officer	Director Human Resources

Approval date	March 2012
Effective date	March 2012
Approval date of last revision	22 March 2019
Effective date of last revision	22 March 2019
Date of procedure review*	31 March 2020
Related legislation, policies, procedures, guidelines and local protocols	Academic Promotions Policy Guidelines in the Criteria and Evidence Requirements for Promotion to Levels B and C, D and E Academic Promotions Application Pro-forma Levels B and C, D and E Academic Promotions Guide for Applicants Academic Promotions Guide for Supervisors

*unless otherwise indicated, this policy will still apply beyond the review date

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Applications for promotion to Academic Levels B to E will be invited each year through notices appearing no later than the first working day in April. Submission of applications by email to ACUAcademic.Promotions@acu.edu.au will close on the last working day in June (Levels D and E) and the last working day in July (Levels B and C). A staff member who anticipates being absent from the University during the middle of the year may lodge their application in advance. Only in exceptional circumstances will the Promotions Committee (the Committee), at its absolute discretion, accept a late application.

Applications for promotion to Academic Levels B to E will need to identify the current Academic Career Pathway (ACP) and the ACP for which the application for promotion is being made in the relevant Application for Promotion (pro-forma). ACPs are defined in the Guidelines on the Criteria and Evidence Requirements for Promotions, Levels B and C, Level D and Level E. The Committee will assess all applications according to their merit.

2. Preparing and Submitting an Application

2.1 Documenting a case

The focus of the application should be on work the applicant has done, for the period since appointment, or from the last promotion at ACU (up to five years), which satisfy the promotion criteria, and demonstrates an overall sustained contribution and quality performance for the academic level of promotion applied for.

The application content relating to the promotion criteria should align with academic performance expectations detailed in the Academic Performance Matrix (APM) for the relevant ACP and the *Guidelines on the Criteria and Evidence Requirements for Promotion* (the Guidelines), which encompass the Minimum Standards for Academic Levels (MSALs). In addition, when documenting a case for promotion applicants should articulate how they have developed or are developing relevant Core Competencies as detailed in the Guidelines and ACU Capability Development Framework (CDF). These documents provide comprehensive information regarding the performance expectations and evidence requirements to assist the applicant in building their case for promotion for all ACPs.

Applicants should ensure that they provide evidence to support each of their claims. Although the Committee may seek clarification in writing or in the context of an interview, it is the primary responsibility of the applicant to provide a well-documented case in support of their promotion within the written application. It is not sufficient simply to list claims of achievement.

Applicants may provide the Promotions Committee with advice on the circumstances and impact of any relevant career interruptions (refer to Part 1 of the pro-forma). It is important to indicate how the career interruption has impacted the applicant's opportunity to perform against the promotion criteria.

2.2 The application for promotion pro-forma

Applications must be contained within the pro-forma which is available on the University staff website. Evidence in support of the promotion criteria must be included within the pro-forma. The pro-forma has a strict page limit and material must not be attached to the pro-forma, other than:

- the Student Evaluation of Learning and Teaching (SELT), Student Evaluation of Teaching (SET) or Student Evaluation of Unit (SEU) Survey for two units or equivalent as detailed in the ACU Teaching criteria and standards framework in circumstances where SELT/SET/SEU Surveys are not conducted;

- the, Orion ACU Research Profile Report for the past five years and additional information regarding research contributions; or

- other documents prescribed by the University, such as a higher degree research supervisor's report on progress.

To ensure consistency and equity in process all applications must conform to the above instructions and any pages over the prescribed page limit or additional attachments not listed above will be removed from the application and will not be provided to the Academic Promotions Committee.

2.3 Nomination of referees, assessors and material evidence for assessment

2.3.1   Referees

The referee report provides information to the Academic Promotions Committee regarding the applicant's sustained contribution to the academic level and/or discipline relevant to the applicant's nominated ACP, and identifies possible areas for continued career development.

The Executive Officer of the Academic Promotions Committee shall write to nominated referees and request they complete a confidential referee report that will include questions relevant to the applicant's nominated ACP. Applicants are required to provide the names, addresses, email addresses and telephone numbers of referees in the pro-forma. Referee selection should adhere to the guidance provided below:

Academic Level	Academic Career Pathway	Number of Referees	Referee Selection Guidance
B	Teaching and Research	Two	At least one referee should be external to the University.
	Teaching-focussed	Two	Referees may be internal to the University but should not be from the same school and at least one referee will be from a different Faculty.
	Research-focussed	Two	At least one referee should be external to the University.
	Research-only	Two	At least one referee should be external to the University.
	Academic Leadership/ Service	Two	At least one referee should be external to the University.
C	Teaching and Research	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Teaching-focussed	Three	Referees may be internal to the University but should not be from the same school and at least one referee will be from a different Faculty.
	Research-focussed	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Research-only	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Academic Leadership/ Service	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
D	Teaching and Research	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Teaching-focussed	Three	Referees may be internal to the University but should not be from the same school and at least one referee will be from a different Faculty.
	Research-focussed	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Research-only	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Academic Leadership/ Service	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
E	Teaching and Research	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Teaching-focussed	Three	Referees may be internal to the University but should not be from the same school and at least one referee will be from a different Faculty.
	Research-focussed	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Research-only	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.
	Academic Leadership/ Service	Three	At least two referees should be external to the University.

Important Information for Applicants Regarding Referee Selection

- Referees provided should comply with the guidance above and include referees external to the University where requested;

- The selection of referees from outside the applicant's School allows the Committee to consider the broader scope of contribution.

- Referees are expected to be of high academic and/or professional standing, whose judgment can be relied on by the Committee;

- Referees are generally at a higher level of appointment than the level of promotion sought by the applicant;

- Co-researchers and co-authors may be used, but there should be at least one independent referee;

- Referee selection should include consideration of the referee's knowledge and ability to comment on the applicant's performance in relation to criteria relevant to the ACP of the application. Individual referees may have knowledge of specific areas of the applicant's performance, but in total should cover all aspects of the applicant's performance relevant to the ACP of the application;

- The applicant should seek advice from the nominated supervisor in regards to referee selection;

- Referees can be from within Australia or international;

- Applicants need to confirm that referees are willing to provide a reference and are contactable during August/September of that year;

- It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that referee contact details included in the pro-forma are up to date;

- It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure that referees are well briefed on their work;

- Committee members are not permitted to provide references for applicants;

- A referee may not be the applicant's current supervisor, or have supervised the applicant in the past twelve months.

2.3.2 Assessors (Level D and Level E)

An assessor is an independent person, considered an expert in the applicant's field, who is able to advise the Committee on the standing of the applicant in relation to other senior academics in that field and relevant to the applicant's ACP based on the evaluation of material evidence for assessment provided by the applicant.

The applicant's nominated supervisor, who may seek input from an appropriate senior academic staff member, develops a list of seven independent assessors in consultation with the applicant for consideration by the Committee, guided by the following information:

- Assessors are eminent academics and/or practitioners in the applicant's discipline or field and relevant in the applicant's ACP at the level of Associate Professor or higher.

- The list cannot include PhD supervisors, co-authors, co-editors, other collaborators and referees provided for the application.

The Committee will consider the list and select three independent assessors, who will be requested to evaluate the material evidence for assessment provided by the applicant. In circumstances where the committee is not in agreement with the nominated assessors provided in the application, or an assessor declines, the Chair and the relevant Executive Dean will decide on alternative assessors. If this occurs, the applicant will be advised by the Executive Officer of the Academic Promotions Committee.

Assessors will be provided with copies of the applicant's relevant material evidence for assessment (refer to Section 2.3.3), part 3 of the applicant's pro-forma, an assessment report with questions relevant to the applicant's nominated ACP to complete and where applicable to ACP, a list of the applicant's research output included with the pro-forma.

2.3.3 Material Evidence for Assessment (Level D and Level E)

Applicants are required to provide three items of material evidence that represent their major academic achievements for evaluation by the assessors. Applicants work with their nominated supervisors to select appropriate material evidence.

These items are submitted in addition to the pro-forma. Where by its nature it is impractical to submit an example of non-traditional research, an applicant should provide the Committee with high quality recordings, photographs and/or DVDs of the material.

Three items of material evidence for assessment should be provided in electronic copy as a PDF document or equivalent for distribution to the assessors. Hard copies of the material evidence may be provided where appropriate due to the nature of the material evidence provided. The University will exercise all reasonable care in the custody of hard-copy material evidence but cannot guarantee their security, particularly during the period of their assessment, nor their return.

Electronic copies should be sent to:	**Hard copies should be sent to:**
ACUAcademic.Promotions@acu.edu.au	The Executive Officer
	Academic Promotions Committee
	Office of the Director, Human Resources
	Tenison Woods House
	8-20 Napier Street, North Sydney

Important Information for Applicants regarding the Selection of Material Evidence for Assessment

The three items selected as material evidence form the basis on which the applicant will have their academic achievements assessed so it is important that there is careful consideration given to this decision by the applicant and their nominated supervisor. Material evidence for assessment:

- can include articles in scholarly journals that appear on the Excellence in Research for Australia (ERA) journal list as produced by the Australian Research Council (ARC), commercially published books or book chapters, teaching materials, creative works, non-traditional research outputs and consultant reports.

- should be recent examples of the applicant's most significant work, with a peer review status, since their appointment to ACU, or their last promotion.

- should demonstrate a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge relevant to the ACP of the application and its application in the relevant discipline or field of study.

3. Submission of the application

An application for promotion is submitted to the staff member's nominated supervisor (which is normally either the National Head of School, State Head of School or Deputy Head of School, Research Institute Director, Research Centre Director or Research Program Director), for comment (refer to Part 2 of the pro-forma). Where the staff member and their nominated supervisor are applying for promotion to the same level, the staff member approaches the next level supervisor for the nominated supervisor's report.

The nominated supervisor is expected to review the staff member's draft pro-forma, provide the staff member with feedback and provide advice on assessor and referee selection. The supervisor report (part 2 of the pro-forma) is to provide factual and objective comments on:

- the overall performance of the applicant at their current level; and

- the capacity for the applicant to perform at a higher level, as well as citing reasons for these comments.

It is not the role of the nominated supervisor to:

- comment as to whether the applicant has made a satisfactory, major or outstanding contribution for any of the promotion criteria;

- express an opinion about the application in general; or

- advocate on the applicant's behalf.

The applicant must see, and sign to confirm that they have read, the nominated supervisor's report before sending the completed pro-forma by email to ACUAcademic.Promotions@acu.edu.au.

4. Receipt of the Application

Applications for promotion to Associate Professor (Level D) and Professor (Level E) close on the **last working day** in June.

Applications for promotion to Lecturer (Level B) and Senior Lecturer (Level C) close on the **last working day** in July.

After the application closing dates a quality check of the pro-formas will be conducted by the Executive Officer, Academic Promotions Committee, who will:

- verify that the applicant and nominated supervisor have signed the pro-forma;
- verify the pro-forma adheres to the page limits and there are no additional attachments;
- remove any additional page/s that exceed the prescribed page limits and/or additional attachments not prescribed; and
- verify information provided by the applicant with regard to eligibility.

5. Interviews

Interviews of Levels D and E applicants judged as having a prima facie case for promotion will be conducted, and will normally be held during November each year. Where possible, applicant interviews will be conducted face to face, however if necessary, the Committee may elect to interview an applicant by videoconference or teleconference.

During the interview, the applicant will make a 15-minute presentation to the Committee on how they plan to contribute to the University's Mission, achievement of strategic objectives, provide leadership in their ACP, Faculty/School/Research Institute and/or discipline and their growth into the future if promoted. It is recommended that the applicant dedicate some of the presentation to orientating committee members to their specific discipline and/or area of research. At the conclusion of the presentation the Committee may ask questions about the applicant's presentation and written application.

Applicants invited to interview are required to provide a one-page high level overview of their presentation for the Committee. This should be provided to the Executive Officer, Academic Promotions Committee at least two working days prior to the scheduled interview date. Applicants invited to interview may request to use visual media where relevant to their discipline in advance of the schedule interview.

6. The Decision

The Committee weighs the evidence of performance against the relevant promotion criteria. It is therefore the applicant's responsibility to provide adequate but concise evidence of performance and contribution. The Committee, in making its determination, has regard to both the written material presented and where applicable, the interview. This includes the information contained within Parts 1-3 of the pro-forma and the comments from the referees and assessors.

The Committee meets several times during each promotion round to consider applications, referee and assessor reports and for Levels D and E interview applicants. The Committee may discontinue consideration of an application at any stage of the promotion process should the applicant not meet the criteria and evidence requirements for promotion.

Members of the Committee may discuss and/or seek clarification or verification concerning written statements. The Committee has the right to request further information and/or clarification when they believe the information is needed to make the decision on the application, and when the clarification is based upon information presented in the application.

While a member of the Committee may provide clarification or verification regarding a claim made by an applicant, it is not the role of any member of the Committee to play an advocacy role for particular applicants. A Committee member may, for example, provide factual information in regard to an applicant's role on School committees, their workload, and their research outputs (including, for example, the level of esteem of journals in the relevant discipline).

The Committee will attempt to reach a consensus decision on whether each applicant meets the criteria for promotion. If consensus cannot be reached, a majority decision will be recorded. At its meetings, the Committee will record its

membership, the recommendations and the reasons for them, together with the written advice to be given to unsuccessful applicants.

6.1   Advice of the decision

Applicants will be advised in writing by the Chairperson of the Committee of the outcome of their application following the Vice-Chancellor and President's approval of the Committee's recommendations, which are reported to Senate.

The written advice to an unsuccessful applicant will provide relevant information and guidance to inform the unsuccessful applicant where the application was considered not to have met the promotion criteria.

Unsuccessful applicants will also be invited to contact the Chairperson of the Committee for more detailed advice. In responding to such a request, the Chairperson will normally be accompanied by the applicant's Executive Dean, and/or Nominated Supervisor.

7. Appeals

An unsuccessful applicant may appeal to the Staff Appeals Committee only on the grounds of lack of due process following the conclusion of the annual promotions round (see Staff Appeals Policy).

8. Annual Review

Subsequent to each promotion round the Committee will notify any changes to policy and procedures that will be referred to the ACU Staff Consultative Committee (ACUSCC) for consultation and to the Vice-Chancellor and President for consideration and approval.

9. The Promotions Committee: Membership and Procedures

9.1   Membership

Level B and Level C

- A Chairperson appointed by the Provost who holds a substantive position of Level E.

- A Deputy Chairperson nominated by the Provost

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Innovation) or nominee

- The Executive Deans, or in exceptional circumstances a nominee agreed with the Chairperson

- A person who holds at least a substantive position at Level C, elected by and from the Academic Staff of each Faculty to a panel of elected staff for promotions as outlined in the Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Policy to Levels B and C

The elected staff representative will be drawn from a panel of elected staff, thus allowing the substitution of another elected staff member in the case where one is unavailable.

Quorum: 7 members, including the Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson and the Executive Dean of the Faculty (or nominee) for any applicant under consideration.

Level D

- A Chairperson appointed by the Provost who holds a substantive position of Level E

- A Deputy Chairperson nominated by the Provost

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) or nominee

- Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Innovation) or nominee

- The Executive Deans, or in exceptional circumstances a nominee agreed with the Chairperson

- A person from another University who holds a substantive position at Level E, appointed by the Chairperson

- A person who holds at least a substantive position at Level D, elected by and from the Academic Staff of each Faculty to a panel of elected staff for promotions as outlined in the Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Policy to Level D.

The elected staff representative will be drawn from a panel of elected staff, thus allowing the substitution of another elected staff member in the case where one is unavailable.

Quorum: 7 members, including the Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson and the Executive Dean of the Faculty (or nominee) for any applicant under consideration.

Please note: Elected staff representatives of the Level B and C and Level D Committees applying for promotion will not be eligible to participate in any Academic Promotions Committee in the year of their promotion application. In this case an alternate elected representative will sit on the Committee. Executive Deans are required to attend meetings whether or not there are any applicants from their Faculty. If a Committee Member is unable to attend only in exceptional circumstances can a nominee be sent and then only with advance notice in writing and the agreement of the Chair.

Level E

- The Vice-Chancellor and President as Chairperson or Nominee

- The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research)

- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education and Innovation)

- The Executive Deans

- The Chair, Academic Board

- A professor from another university whose scholarship is recognised internationally

- A person from the Senate and external to the University on the recommendation of the Vice-Chancellor and President

In addition, the Committee may, at its discretion, include another Professor from a relevant discipline in a Committee meeting, by invitation.

Quorum: 7 members, including the Chairperson or nominee of the Vice-Chancellor and President as Chair and the Executive Dean of the Faculty for any applicant under consideration.

9.2   General Instructions

In filling the positions of Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Level B and C and Level D Committees, the Provost will endeavour to provide for reasonable continuity of office and gender balance.

9.3   Observers

The Director, Human Resources (or nominee) may observe any aspect of the process.

In addition, an elected staff member may attend Promotions Committee meetings as an observer but must not be an applicant for promotion. The elected staff member must hold the following Academic Level:

- Level C, D or E, for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer Promotions Committee meetings and

- Level D or E for Associate Professor Promotions Committee meetings.

Observers may not speak concerning the merits of any application, but are expected to alert the Committee through the Chairperson to any apparent departure from approved procedure.

9.4 Meeting Arrangements

The Committees will meet as necessary to consider applications, referee reports and assessor reports, as applicable. Interviews and presentations for Level D and Level E applicants will normally take place during November of each year.

Meetings may be held face to face or via videoconference or teleconference at the discretion of the Chairperson.

All papers and deliberations of the Committee are to be treated as strictly confidential by Committee members, observers and administrative staff supporting the Committee.

All meeting proceedings are to have regard to the principles of equity and diversity.

The Committee will be supported administratively by an appropriate officer of the University, or Human Resources.

10. Further Assistance

Any staff member who requires assistance in understanding this procedure should first consult their nominated supervisor who is responsible for the implementation and operation of these arrangements in their work area. Should further information or advice be required staff should visit Service Central.