



ACADEMIC PROMOTIONS

2015 POLICY & PROCEDURES

LODGEMENT DATES

ONE copy of the application
must be lodged with the Dean's
Unit by:

LECTURER
3 August 2015

SENIOR LECTURER
27 April 2015

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR
25 May 2015

PROFESSOR
20 July 2015

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	2
DEFINITIONS	4
CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION	5
SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PROMOTION TRACKS.....	7
PROCEDURES.....	8
Consultation with the Dean and Head of School.....	8
Head of school report.....	8
Referee reports.....	10
Format of the application.....	12
Submitting the application	12
DECISION-MAKING PROCESS.....	13
Faculty Promotion Committees (FPC)	13
University Promotion Committee (UPC)	15
Approvals and Effective Date of Promotion	16
Appeals	16
APPENDIX A	18
FACULTY OF LAW – Faculty specific guidelines for promotion.....	18
FACULTY OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES - Specific Guidelines for Promotion	22
(National Centre for HIV Social Research and Social Policy Research Centre)	
FACULTY OF MEDICINE - Faculty specific guidelines for promotion (Applied Biostatisticians)	
AUSTRALIAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS - Faculty specific guidelines for promotion	

INTRODUCTION

This policy details how academic staff who can demonstrate sustained excellence in research, teaching, engagement and leadership may be promoted.

As academic staff progress through the promotion levels there is an expectation that:

- there will be an increase in the quality and impact of their research output
- there will be an increase in the quality and effectiveness of their teaching and their contribution to all aspects of learning and teaching
- their role in the promotion of scholarship will expand
- their qualitative contribution to their discipline will increase
- they will demonstrate increasing leadership.

Principles

- The academic promotion policy is aligned to the academic strategic goals and priorities of the University
- The academic promotion policy supports the guiding principles as a University as outlined in the B2B Blueprint to Beyond: UNSW Strategic Intent, including:
 1. Academic freedom
 2. Leadership
 3. Innovation, initiative and creativity
 4. Recognition of merit and excellence
 5. Integrity and high ethical standards
 6. Equity, opportunity and diversity
 7. Mutual respect, collegiality, teamwork and high service standards
 8. Professionalism, accountability and transparency
 9. Safety
 10. Environmental sustainability
- The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (for promotions up to the level of Associate Professor) and the Vice-Chancellor (for promotion to the level of Professor) will ensure that all applicants recommended for promotion have adhered to the guiding principles as a University as outlined in the B2B Blueprint to Beyond UNSW Strategic Intent.
- The University is committed to the principles of equity and a process conducted in a manner that upholds the principles of fairness and is free from direct and indirect discrimination
- Academic promotion is based primarily on the merit of the case presented
- Assessment of applications for promotion is made by a committee of peers through a process designed to enable a fair and consistent application of standards
- The academic promotions policy and procedures apply to all academic staff who are eligible to apply for promotion

- Usually applicants should have completed two years of service since their appointment at UNSW, or their most recent promotion, before they become eligible for promotion. The Faculty Dean may apply to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for this two year requirement to be waived.
- The Dean will ensure that all applicants who intend to apply for promotion have adhered to the guiding principles of the University as outlined in the B2B Blueprint to Beyond UNSW Strategic Intent.
- The outcome of previous applications for promotion has no relevance in a current promotion round
- An academic staff member whose application for promotion is unsuccessful is required to wait two years before submitting a further application, unless the Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor support an earlier application
- A promotion round will normally be conducted every year for all four promotion levels (Lecturer through to Professor)
- The Director, Human Resources, will submit an annual Academic Promotion Timetable to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for approval. The timetable for academic promotion will be available on the HR web site at: <http://www.hr.unsw.edu.au/employee/acad/acadprom.html>
- Late academic promotion applications will **not** be accepted
- Applicants may withdraw their application at any time prior to the convening of the Faculty Promotions Committee
- Academic staff can be promoted via the Out of Rounds promotion mechanism (refer to the Out of Rounds web link)

DEFINITIONS

The following definitions apply for the purpose of this policy.

There are 5 categories of performance referred to in the documentation as below:

1. Sustained level of performance
2. Superior level of performance
3. Outstanding level of performance
4. Outstanding Plus level of performance
5. Not Sustained level of performance

Please note that for academic staff appointed to a Research Only position and who have applied on an Outstanding Plus level of performance for Research, then an Acceptable level of performance is required in the areas of Learning and Teaching, as well as, in the area of Engagement and Leadership.

For each of these categories, performance at a particular level will reflect:

- (a) comparison of the performance of the individual with what is expected of an academic in that cohort (track). Specifically, staff applying for promotion in teaching track will be compared against the performance expected of the cohort of UNSW teachers.
- (b) performance over a number of years, particularly recent years.

The definitions assume and do not restate the above.

1. **Sustained performance** – performing at the standard expected for the bottom quartile of the level above the current level of appointment
2. **Superior performance**– performing at the standard expected at the midpoint of the level above the current level of appointment
3. **Outstanding performance** – performing at the standard expected between the midpoint and the top quartile of the level above the current level of appointment
4. **Outstanding Plus performance** – performing at the standard expected of the top quartile of the level above the current level of appointment
5. **Not Sustained performance** – performing no higher than at the current level of appointment

For Research Only Staff, an Acceptable level of performance – requires evidence of ongoing contribution to the university in teaching, engagement and leadership. Teaching includes HDR supervision.

CRITERIA FOR ACADEMIC PROMOTION

- Applicants should nominate whether their application is to be considered as research track, teaching track or combined track. Criteria relate to what is expected of an academic in the particular track or cohort and reflect performance over a number of years. The table on the next page summarises the criteria.
- The onus is on the applicant to select the appropriate promotion track that they wish to be assessed against. Promotion Committees are reluctant to consider an applicant on a different track other than the one nominated by the applicant unless exceptional circumstances exist.
- In terms of research performance there is an expectation that an applicant's research performance will be consistent with what is expected within the top three universities in Australia (relevant to the discipline)
- Promotion to Associate Professor or Professor level is unlikely unless an applicant's publications are in top journals or equivalent and that there is also evidence of competitive grant funding. In all cases the relevant promotion committees will be mindful not only of the absolute level of performance but also of the trajectory.
- In terms of learning and teaching performance applicants should calibrate their performance across the highest levels of UNSW and for higher levels of promotion there is an expectation of external recognition.
- In terms of engagement and leadership contributions the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate how their contributions have added value to the institution highlighting the impact of their individual contributions. At all levels we expect applicants to be able to demonstrate engagement with UNSW with levels of engagement outside the organization increasing with seniority.
- Applications for promotion at all levels should demonstrate the leadership contributions they have made. Those applying for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor should demonstrate evidence of leadership that is extending in scope and complexity. Those applying for promotion to Professor will be expected to demonstrate evidence of leadership extending beyond UNSW.
- Although promotion is mainly dependent on demonstrated ability and achievement since the applicant's appointment to their current position, total career performance (including at other institutions) is considered. In exceptional circumstances promotion may be judged primarily on achievement prior to appointment to the current position.
- Applicants are strongly encouraged to present clear and concise data to support their claims for promotion, for example, a graphical representation of research productivity over time. Please ensure that only black and white graphs or tables are used.
- Evidence should be provided to substantiate claims of the quality and impact of the contributions made.
- Applicants are encouraged to focus on two or three examples that best illustrate what they have achieved rather than catalogue every possible example.
- Cross-reference linkages in the application rather than repeat evidence. For example, postgraduate supervision of students is relevant to both teaching and research but should be covered once.
- Academic staff members who have been appointed to a Research Only position are only able to apply for promotion on the Research Track. For such applicants two options are available (Please refer to the Summary of Academic Promotion Tracks)

Specific Standards of Contribution

- Applicants should refer to Schedule 3 of the *UNSW (Academic Staff) Enterprise Agreement (2011)* which specifies position classification standards

SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PROMOTION TRACKS

CATEGORY	RESEARCH TRACK			TEACHING TRACK			COMBINED TRACK		
	Research	L & T	E&L	Research	L & T	E&L	Research	L & T	E&L
Lecturer	O	S	S	S	O	S	Sup	Sup	S
Senior Lecturer	O	S	S	S/Sup*	O	S/Sup*	Sup	Sup	S
Associate Professor	O	S	S	S/Sup*	O	S/Sup*	Sup	Sup	Sup
Professor	O	S	S	S/Sup*	O	S/Sup*	Sup	Sup	Sup

<p>If appointed to a Research Only position either need O+ for Research and A for Teaching, Engagement and Leadership or Outstanding for Research and Sustained for both Teaching, Engagement & Leadership are required.</p>	<p>For Teaching Track O+ applicants, both Research and Engagement & Leadership must be at a Sustained level.</p>
--	--

Outstanding Plus is expected standard at the top quartile of level above current appointment (O+)

Outstanding is expected standard between the midpoint and the top quartile of the level above current appointment (O)

Superior is expected standard at the midpoint of level above current appointment (Sup)

Sustained is expected standard for the bottom quartile of the level above the current level of appointment (S)

Not Sustained is a level of performance that is no higher than at the current level (NS)

Acceptable level of performance requires evidence of ongoing contribution to the university in teaching, engagement and leadership. Teaching includes HDR supervision (A)

NB: Expected levels of performance are in particular cohort/track and will reflect performance over a number of years. Academic staff members who have a Research Only appointment are only able to apply on the Research Track.

PROCEDURES

This document sets out the application procedure to be followed in relation to academic promotion at UNSW.

Consultation with the Dean and Head of School

Staff should seek advice from their Dean and Head of School before initiating an application for promotion. Deans and Heads of School may not withhold an application for promotion.

Head of School report

It is the responsibility of the applicant to ensure that a copy of the application is given to the Head of School with sufficient time before the submission closing date to allow the Head of School to complete their report before the application is submitted. In unusual circumstances (e.g. the applicant is the Head of School, or the Head of School is a recent appointee), it may be more appropriate for someone else (such as the previous Head of School) to write the report.

The applicant has the right to view and sign the Head of School report. An applicant may provide written comments to the Head of School report. Any such comments must be signed by both the applicant and the Head of School and attached to the initial report. The Head of School should not provide a counter response to the applicant's comments.

The applicant may choose to waive the right to view the Head of School's report. The Faculty Promotions Committee (and the University Promotions Committee if relevant) will be informed as to whether the report has or has not been viewed by the applicant.

The Head of School's report should be made available to referees.

Heads of School are required to use the Head of School report template that can be accessed on the HR website. The report would be expected to address the following areas:

Research

What would be expected in the discipline in terms of quality and quantity of publications and how the applicant has performed.

For a teaching track application, this may be what would be expected in terms of quality and quantity of publications related to scholarship of learning and teaching, and how the applicant has performed. For a teaching track application at the Associate Professor promotion level there is an expectation that applicants would have evidence of scholarship in the area of learning and teaching. Progressing to the Professorial promotion level where there would be an expectation of both scholarship, research publications and leadership, as well as, evidence of grant funding in the area of learning and teaching.

What would be expected in the discipline in terms of HDR supervision and how the applicant has performed.

What would be expected in the discipline in terms of research grant funding and how the applicant has performed and/or, for a teaching track application, what would be expected in terms of grant funding for learning and teaching, and how the applicant has performed

Provide information concerning an applicant's role in joint publications, research grants and postgraduate supervision and if relevant an applicant's individual contribution to collaborative team efforts.

Teaching

What would be expected within the School in terms of teaching and how does the applicant compare – this might include the range and amount of teaching the applicant undertakes, such as, whether they are teaching courses judged to be difficult or challenging.

What is the standard of the applicant's teaching? – this might include comments about course design and assessment, innovation, use of technology.

The effectiveness of the applicant's teaching for instance as shown through student evaluation, peer review, and in terms of student achievement.

What action the applicant has taken to develop their teaching in response to this feedback, as well as through involvement in development activities.

Engagement & Leadership

In developing an engagement and leadership portfolio, the Head of School should comment on the applicant's achievements and contribution through engagement and leadership in relation to the following categories:

- Contribution to governance, strategic direction and planning, capacity building and/or development of inclusive cultures within UNSW. This contribution is expected of all applicants irrespective of the level of promotion being sought
- Community engagement through significant contributions to the Australian, global or business and government communities or through building partnerships with the community
- Contribution to the profession and or discipline through engagement in the governance of professional bodies; editing, refereeing, evaluation of research or other activities and/or through contribution of professional or disciplinary expertise to the community
- Knowledge Transfer and Policy Development
- Thought leadership through engaging with wider society, reinforcing the universities role in critical public debate

The Standing of the Referees

Prior to the applicant's interview before the Faculty Promotions Committee, the Head of School is asked to provide a brief written summary on the standing of the referees nominated by both the applicant and those that have been nominated by the Dean.

Supplementary Head of School Report (optional)

Having read confidential referee reports solicited by Human Resources, the Head of School may present a written supplementary report to the Faculty Promotions Committee if they wish to comment on any issues raised in the confidential referee reports.

Referee reports

Applicant Referees

- Applicants should discuss with their Head of School the referees they propose to nominate.
- Applicants should seek the concurrence of referees before confirming their nominations and should provide referees with a copy of their application.
- The Head of School, Dean or anyone directly involved in the assessment process may not be nominated as a referee.
- Applicants for promotion to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer should provide the names and contact details of two (2) people who may act as referees.
- Applicants for promotion to Associate Professor should provide the names of two (2) people who may act as referees. All referees nominated by the applicant must be external to the University.
- Applicants for promotion to Professor should provide the names of three (3) people who may act as referees. All referees nominated by the applicant must be external to the University.

Independent Referees nominated by the University

- The University, on the recommendation of the Dean, will invite one additional referee who would be able provide independent and authoritative advice on an application for promotion to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer. Two such referees are required in the case of an application for Associate Professor and three such referees are required in the case of an application for promotion to the level of Professor.
- The Head of School will prepare for the Dean's consideration a panel of suitable referees. The panel should include a minimum of two referees for promotion to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, a minimum of four referees for promotion to Associate Professor and a minimum of five referees for promotion to the level of Professor.
- The Head of School should contact potential independent referees prior to the submission of a panel list to the Dean so as to ascertain as to whether those on the list are prepared to act as an independent referee if contacted by the university.
- The applicant should have the right to comment on the suitability of the referees that have been provided to the Dean by the Head of School.
- The Dean will determine which referees are chosen from the list provided by the Head of School and will ensure that appropriate referees are selected in terms of providing an independent assessment of an application.
- The emphasis is on ensuring that quality independent referees are obtained (usually not former supervisors or co-authors) with the greatest weight given to those independent referees from highly recognised peer universities or equivalent institutions.
- All independent referees for level D&E promotion must be external to the University.
- The Dean will advise the Academic Promotions Manager of the name and contact details of the referee/s selected from the panel
- The applicant should not be advised of the Dean's final selection/selections.

Viewing of Referees Reports

- Reports from referees will be requested in confidence.
- The Head of School and applicant's observer may view all referee reports prior to attending a Faculty Promotion Committee meeting. The reports will be made available to such appropriate people by the Academic Promotions Manager.
- Copies of the reports will again be made available to the Head of School and applicant's observer at the interview.
- Referee Reports are strictly confidential and as such members of promotion committees, as well as others who have the right to view such reports are bound by confidentiality. Under no circumstances should the contents of confidential referee reports be discussed or made available to applicants.

Testimonials

Testimonials and references, aside from those requested by the University with respect to an application, will not be considered. Including this material in an application may detract from the overall assessment of the portfolio and is strongly discouraged.

Format of the application

The application should be presented in the following sequence:

1. Completed Application for Academic Promotion Summary form (Form A)
2. The Pro-Forma executive summary page that highlights the key areas of contribution that best illustrate the quality and impact of the applicants' research, teaching and engagement and leadership contributions.
3. The case for promotion (9 page maximum) The case for promotion will include a research, teaching, engagement and leadership case with the exception of those applicants with limited teaching opportunities. In these limited cases, the applicant is only expected to provide a statement regarding evidence of the effectiveness of their teaching in terms of their students' learning. See Academic Promotions Toolkit.

The case for promotion must be typed in size 11 or larger font, presented as single sided A4 paper with pages numbered. The application should not be bound but held together by a fold back clip or paper binder.

Evidence should be provided within the body of the application to substantiate claims of quality and impact of contributions made.

It is not necessary for applicants to provide a folder of supporting documentation or materials, however, applicants may be called upon at the time of their interview to provide a particular source of evidence or supporting material, for example, a particular research publication or teaching evaluations.

Applicants will be informed in advance of the Faculty Promotions Committee meeting if such supporting evidence is required.

4. Completed Research and Teaching Activities Form (Forms B) – Both Form A and B are not included in the case for promotion page limit.

The Head of School's report and referees' reports are added to the application by the Academic Promotions Manager.

Submitting the application

Academic promotion applications must be submitted to the relevant Dean's unit by the due date.

Applicants must also send an electronic copy of their application (the 10 page application along with Form B only) to the Academic Promotions Manager in Human Resources.

It is the responsibility of the Dean's unit to ensure that the application has been signed by the Dean and that the appropriate number of independent referees (relative to the level of promotion) have been selected.

The Dean's unit will ensure that all applications that have been received will be submitted to the Academic Promotions Manager within two working days after the official closing date.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS

This section sets out the Faculty and University decision-making process followed in relation to academic promotions at UNSW.

Faculty Promotion Committees (FPC)

In the case of applications for promotion to Lecturer and Senior Lecturer, the FPC is required to make recommendations, with reasons, to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) as to which applicants should be promoted and which applicants should not be promoted. In the case of applications for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, the FPC is required to make recommendations which will be further considered by a University Promotions Committee that will make the recommendation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) in the case of Associate Professor and the Vice-Chancellor in the case of Professor as to which applicants should be promoted and which applicants should not be promoted.

Composition

- Faculty Promotion Committees (FPC) shall have the following membership:
 - Dean (Presiding Member) ex officio
 - Up to five (5) committee members from the Faculty nominated by the Dean.

The term of office for these members is three (3) years.

- At least two members should have expertise in reviewing contributions to teaching.
- At least one (1) member of another Faculty or from another University and approved by the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Academic), whose term of office is for a maximum of two (2) years.
- All members must hold at least the same rank as that for which candidates are being considered. With the exception of ex-officio members, the Dean should make every effort to ensure that representation is included from an applicant's broad subject area. The Presiding Member may co-opt to the committee one further member where this is not achieved through the normal membership.
- All committees must include male and female members.
- No member of an FPC, other than the Dean, may serve consecutive terms. However, at the discretion of the Dean a member or members may be appointed for to serve an additional term in order to maintain a degree of continuity within the committee membership.
- A quorum for an FPC is five (5)

Terms of Reference

The FPC will take into account: the application documents and materials referred to and made available by the applicant, the Head of School's report and reports from referees.

Process

- All applicants are provided the opportunity to be interviewed by the FPC.
- Members of FPC should attempt to provide advance notice of the need to view evidence or specific questions that they may have for candidates. This is particularly important when clarification of facts are sought, such as number of citations or number of students in a course. In general both the Head of School and the applicant will receive these questions at least one day prior to the interview.

- Applicants may nominate another member of the academic staff of the University, who has knowledge and expertise relevant to the application, to attend the interview with the Head of School as an observer. However, a nominated referee is not permitted to act as an observer. The Head of School and observer are not advocates; they are not permitted to introduce new information nor make personal comments on the application. The Head of School and the observer will meet with the Faculty Promotions Committee before, during and after the interview and may take part in the committee discussion but must not be present for the vote nor the final ranking of the candidates.
- Where an applicant has nominated a colleague to attend the interview, then the nominated colleague must be available to attend the applicant's scheduled interview in person. No provision will be made for a nominated colleague to be involved in the interview process via a telephone conference.
- The interview provides applicants with an opportunity to further their claims for promotion and for members of the promotion committees with an opportunity to seek explanations or clarifications on matters within a promotion application from the applicant and /or Head of School.
- In the event that applicants receive significant information that they believe is relevant to their application, after they have submitted their application but before the Faculty Promotion Committee convenes, they may present an update of no more than one page to the Presiding Member of the promotion committee at the time of the interview.
- Applicants who are unable to attend a prearranged interview have the option of:
 - agreeing to be considered in absentia
 - returning to UNSW for the interview at their own expense
 - being interviewed by conference telephone or video conference at the expense of the Faculty
 - deferring their application until a new round when they are available for interview
- All FPC members must vote either for or against a promotion for each applicant. The vote is by secret ballot but the outcome must be known and recorded. For applicants to lecturer and senior lecturer, no more than one member of the FPC may vote against promotion for the recommendation for promotion to be supported. For applicants to associate professor or professor, no more than two members may vote against promotion if the FPC is to recommend promotion.
- The Presiding Member is required to prepare a list of applicants and indicate those recommended for promotion and those not recommended with the voting numbers included. In all cases, the reasons for the recommendations, with reference to the relevant criteria, should be provided. In particular when the vote is not unanimous, the reason(s) for the divided opinions should be made clear. The report is to be signed by all members of the corresponding FPC. Members may have a dissenting report attached if they wish.
- The FPC reserves the right to consider other data or relevant information beyond the application, such as, the outcome of grant applications, recent teaching evaluations or the assessment of a relevant Faculty Tenure Appointment Committee

University Promotion Committee (UPC)

The primary role of the UPC is to consider the applications for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor together with the recommendations from the corresponding FPCs, and to make a recommendation to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) for promotion to the level of Associate Professor and to the Vice-Chancellor for promotion to the level of Professor as to which applicants should be promoted and which applicants should not be promoted. There is an expectation that the standards required for promotion to Associate Professor and Professor are applied uniformly across the University

Composition

- The University Promotion Committee (UPC) shall have the following membership.
 - A Deputy Vice-Chancellor, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor – Presiding Member (ex officio)
 - President, or a Deputy President, Academic Board (ex officio)
 - Eight (8) members appointed by the Vice-Chancellor including two (2) members of the professoriate chosen in consultation with the President of the Academic Board
 - One member who is a senior academic from another university.
- All members of the UPC must be at least at the level for which applications are under consideration. However, academics from outside the University whose rank may be below that of the level for which candidates are being considered, but who possess relevant special knowledge, may be included in the Committee membership.
- Except for ex officio and external members, the term of office of members of the UPC is three (3) years.
- The term of office of the external member is two (2) years.
- Except for ex officio members, no member of the UPC may serve for two (2) consecutive terms. However, at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) a member or members may be appointed for to serve an additional term in order to maintain a degree of continuity within the committee membership.
- A staff member may not be a member of an FPC and a UPC for the same promotion level.
- Deans are not eligible for membership for the UPC.
- A quorum for a UPC is ten (10)

Terms of Reference

There will be two (2) UPC meetings each year: one to consider applications for promotion to Associate Professor, and a second to consider applications for promotion to Professor. The UPC will take into account: the application, documents and materials referred to and made available by the applicant; the Head of School report and reports from referees.

Process

- Deans may be interviewed by the committee, individually. The purpose is to clarify issues and respond to questions by the Committee members.
- Applicants are not interviewed by the Committee.

- A vote will be taken as to whether or not each applicant should be promoted. If there are more than three negative votes, the applicant is not to be promoted.
- If the UPC's resolutions differ from the recommendations of a Faculty Promotion Committee, the Presiding Member of the UPC should provide feedback to the Presiding Member of the FPC.
- The University Promotions Committee reserves the right to consider other data or relevant information from sources beyond the application such as, the outcomes of ARC and NH&MRC applications.

Approvals and Effective Date of Promotion

All promotions up to the level of Associate Professor will be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and promotions to the level of Professor will be approved by the Vice-Chancellor. The effective dates of promotions are set out below:

Lecturer, Associate Professor and Professor: 1 January of the following year. Senior Lecturer: 1 July of the current year.

Feedback to Unsuccessful Candidates

If requested, feedback will be provided by the Presiding Member of the FPC to applicants who unsuccessfully applied for promotion to Lecturer or Senior Lecturer, and by the Presiding Member of the UPC to applicants who unsuccessfully applied for promotion to Associate Professor or Professor. Such feedback normally would be conveyed to the Head of School (for applicants for Lecturer and Senior Lecturer and to Deans for applicants for Associate Professor and Professor)

Feedback to unsuccessful candidates is for professional development purposes and may not be used as grounds for appeal.

Appeals

There is no provision for an appeal against unsuccessful application other than in cases where the applicant has reason to believe there has been a significant procedural irregularity.

An appeal on procedural grounds must be made within ten working days of the notification of the results of an application for promotion.

Appeals must be in writing and directed to the Director, Human Resources. The appeal must specify the alleged breach of procedures and indicate how it is perceived that the alleged breach may have influenced the promotion outcome.

The Director Human Resources in consultation with the relevant Dean and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or Vice-Chancellor shall ensure that the appeal is investigated and on the basis of that investigation, may determine either:

- That there was no procedural irregularity and that the appeal has been dismissed; or
- That there was procedural irregularity but that there is no evidence to suggest that it would have materially affected the outcome of the application; or
- That there was procedural irregularity and that it may have materially affected the outcome of the application. In such cases, the application will be referred back to

the appropriate Promotion Committee for reconsideration, or alternative and appropriate action taken.

The Director, Human Resources shall advise the appellant of the outcome of the appeal in writing.

There is no further avenue of appeal within the University.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY OF LAW – Faculty specific guidelines for promotion

Law disciplinary guide to the interpretation of UNSW promotion criteria

Generally, the main indicators of research quality are gross numbers of publications, publication in journals deemed to be ranked highly, publication by commercial publishers, high levels of publication citation, international recognition, competitive grants, and completed supervisions of research degrees. While these are used to varying extents as indicators of research quality in law, their relevance must be considered in light of discipline-specific considerations. The notes below are intended to help faculty and university promotion committees in using these general criteria in a discipline-specific setting. They draw on reports on research in Australian law schools from the 1987 Pearce Report (*Australian Law Schools*) to the 2012 Report of the Council of Australian Law Deans (*Assessing Research Performance in the Discipline of Law, 2006-2011*).

1. *Journal rankings*

There is no generally accepted rank of law journals. The 2010 ERA list was highly contentious, flawed and should not be used. (Doing so runs counter to specific advice from the ARC: see www.arc.gov.au/era/faq.htm). An updated version of a list produced by the Council of Australian Law Deans will be a better (if imperfect) guide.

However, any general ranking finds difficulty in dealing with the fact that, in some areas of legal research, publishing in a domestic, niche journal which may be low-ranked will be a better outlet than a high-ranked general journal. The ARC expressed recognition of this by stating it 'will use a refined quality indicator for ERA 2012. Evaluation committees will assess the appropriateness of the journals used as publication outlets for research, taking into account any regional or applied focus of the disciplinary unit concerned'. According to ARC CEO, Professor Margaret Sheil, "The change empowers committee members to use their expert judgment to take account of nuances in publishing behaviour. This approach will allow experts to make judgements about the quality of journals in the context of each discipline." (Minister Senator Carr's media release, 30 May 2011).

The consensus is that this problem of disciplinary specialization can only be averted by peer review. While effective peer review is very difficult in mass research assessment exercises, it is not in promotion processes. Referees are able to provide specific peer review. In assessing law promotion applications, referees should be asked to comment particularly on the quality of research outputs. Peer review is also provided by the Head of School in her report and by members of the Faculty Promotion Committee.

2. *International journals*

Appropriateness of journal type varies across law's sub-disciplines. While, for example, an international lawyer or a legal theorist may look to international journals, a property or contract lawyer is much less likely to do so because of the jurisdictional specificity of the law. Some types of law are state or nationally focused and research on them is normally appropriate in domestic journals. Thus local publication should not be viewed

as necessarily an indicator of poorer quality than publication in international journals. Correspondingly, many legal researchers may have a strong domestic profile but receive only limited international recognition due to the jurisdictional-specific nature of the research they carry out.

More generally, law does not have the kind of international hierarchy of generalist journals found in some other disciplines: there is no legal equivalent of *Science* or *Nature*. Prestigious journals such as *Harvard Law Review* and *Modern Law Review* are much more likely to publish work by, respectively, American and British authors than authors from other countries.

Consequently, national recognition and influence may be a better indicator of esteem and expertise in some fields of research. This is particularly true if the field of research is practically focused in the sense of encouraging domestic law reform.

3. Citation

Citation metrics are not widely used within law to assess research, and thus such metrics are not consistently collected. Some metrics for some interdisciplinary work may be extrapolated from other disciplines, but there is no consistency allowing general use. Many major law journals are not included in citation surveys.

Citation of publications by law reform bodies and by some superior courts is becoming more common but recognition of legal research's impact is patchy. Most legal counsel and courts rarely acknowledge all their sources in written opinions and judgments. Thus lack of citations does not necessarily indicate poor quality, lack of readership or impact.

4. Quantity of research outputs

Quantity is not in itself a sufficient measure of productivity or quality in research in law. Disciplinary conventions are very different from those in some non-HASS disciplines.

As in many other humanities disciplines, it is not unusual for legal researchers to focus on producing a major book, book chapter or lengthy journal article rather than numerous short articles, or co-authored articles. It is often not appropriate for legal researchers to publish interim results of large projects, and it is common in law to publish work which is less frequent, but is longer and more likely to be sole-authored (rather than large numbers of shorter, joint-authored works).

Many legal journals publish articles significantly longer than is the norm in other disciplines.

While collaborative work and research teams are increasingly common in law, attribution of authorship is more confined than elsewhere. Direct involvement in writing rather than, for example, association with a research grant is required.

Supervisors in law would not be listed as authors of work by higher research degree candidates unless in exceptional circumstances.

These factors mean that a legal researcher may have fewer publications than one in a non-HASS discipline. Quality is a more significant criterion than quantity.

5. *Competitive research grants*

Holding a competitive research grant should be regarded as desirable but not necessary for promotion to levels D & E. UNSW Law is consistently in the top 3 of Go8 law schools for competitive grant income. None the less, many legal academics do not hold competitive research grants.

In general, research funding is less available for Law than in some non-HASS disciplines. Specifically, some areas of legal research are less appropriate than others for funded research. It is, for example, much harder to attract ARC funding for doctrinal research in private law than for empirical research in public law: yet both are of equal significance. Legal researchers are more likely to use documentary than other research methods, such as surveys, interviewing, and other fieldwork: it is much harder to win research funding for the former than the latter. Some areas of legal research lend themselves to large grant applications, but the absence of competitive grant funding in law does not in itself indicate poor quality work.

6. *Postgraduate research supervision*

While the numbers of research students in law are growing (and UNSW Law is consistently in the Go8 top 3), they are less common than in some other disciplines and there are also sub-disciplinary inconsistencies. Research candidates – and consequently opportunities to be involved in research supervision – are more common in some areas than others. Consequently, lack of supervisions and lack of completions should not be assumed to be a negative indicator.

7. *Texts and case books*

In law, texts have a particular significance. Superior texts and case commentary books are not merely secondary materials produced for students. In a tradition going back to the middle ages, superior texts are written by professional and academic lawyers not just to state the law as it is, but to develop and constitute it. Many will contain significant scholarly work and high levels of original and scholarly analysis. These works are seen by the profession as more authoritative than journal articles and often have significant impact in the way legal arguments are developed by counsel and the law is interpreted by courts. UNSW Law has a strong tradition of publishing high quality texts of this kind.

Of course, there are also more conventional student texts. They are often published by the same publishers as the texts discussed above. The selection of which books should properly be treated as research products cannot be done by proxy (that is, by reference to publishers) but can be done by referees providing discipline-specific peer review.

8. *Non-conventional publications*

In Law, some non-conventional publications written as part of the commitment to professional engagement and public service should be treated as equal to other research outputs. These include law reform submissions and reports which often include substantial original research contributions to policy and advocacy work. They make a valuable contribution to the development of law, and while they are often seen as 'service' they may also contain high quality research. Normally, it is expected that research of this kind will eventually be published in conventional outlets and any reasons why this has not occurred must be explained.

Applicants for promotion are expected to make the case that these are research if they wish them to be recognised as such. Evidence of social impact, peer review or its equivalent may be available. Confirmation of authorship responsibility (in case of reports or submissions involving teams) will be needed. In some cases, the placing of the reports on the public record precludes further publication in academic journals. Where this is the case applicants should detail any such restrictions, in order to indicate that the work is in its final form and not intended to form the basis of further publication.

9. Impact

As a research discipline, law has a strong focus on producing material which critiques current legal practice with a view to enhancing the quality of law's service to society. In many areas of legal endeavour, academic publication is a means to that end. Consequently, the discipline places great store on the potential for real world change that a research outcome has, as well as on the status of the mode by which the research is disseminated. As noted in (7) and (8), providing conventional evidence of impact may be problematic.

10. Referees

While international referees will be desirable, it will be appropriate in some areas (for reasons noted above) to call on domestic referees, and to use referees from the profession who can assess the impact of publications.

Given the significance of peer review to research assessments in law, the selection of appropriate referees, clear instructions to them, and close attention to their reports are particularly important in Law. Referees may be of particular assistance to promotion committees in commenting on how the discipline-specific factors noted above apply to specific candidates for promotion.

FACULTY OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES - Specific Guidelines for Promotion

National Centre for HIV Social Research and Social Policy Research Centre

The National Centre in HIV Social Research (NCHSR) and the Social Policy Research Centre (SPRC) are research centres of significant size, comparable to that of schools, in the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences. Each has its own individual mission, a distinct funding base and a particular pattern of intellectual production and community engagement. Nevertheless, both centres share a number of features that distinguish them, in important ways, from FASS schools. Recruitment reflects each centre's mission, and therefore staff in NCHSR and SPRC have career 'tracks' that are not directly comparable with those of academic staff in the Schools. These unique features, and the forms of academic production they generate, merit consideration by Faculty and University Promotion Committees, when they consider applications for promotion from NCHSR and SPRC.

The fact that staff in these centres do not have regular teaching responsibilities can lead to misleading comparisons with 'research-only' staff in schools, who are supported by ARC or other fellowships. Very few researchers in NCHSR and SPRC have continuing employment. Most fund their salaries through commissioned research.

As with all schools and centres in FASS, the work of the NCHSR and SPRC closely reflects the ideals expressed in *Blueprint to Beyond*, the statement of UNSW's strategic direction. Three aspects of their work are particularly salient:

- the focus on 'contemporary and social issues'
- the team-based nature of much of their research, and so the co-authorship of a high proportion of their outputs
- the close links of their research to 'professions, community organisations, government, academic and international bodies'.

Three areas relevant to promotion merit particular attention: research, teaching, and the supervision of HDR students.

RESEARCH

Because their predominant outputs have to meet the needs and conventions of commissioned research, the performance requirements of staff employed in these centres are significantly different from those of staff employed in FASS schools.

Researchers in the NCHSR and SPRC are expected to allocate a comparatively small proportion of their time to research monographs, journal articles, chapters in scholarly books and refereed conference papers. In neither Centre would staff be expected - or permitted - to allocate 40 per cent of their time to these categories of outputs. (Forty percent is an allocation that is approximated by many staff in the FASS Schools). In practice, for Centre staff, as little as 10 per cent of an individual's time may be available for working on the categories of publication listed above.

Given that they routinely work as members of collaborative research teams, Centre staff are likely to report a higher proportion of co-authored and multi-authored reports and journal articles than their peers in social science and humanities Schools.

The scholarly nature of many of the commissioned research outputs should be recognised, even though they may take the form of reports rather than peer-reviewed

articles. Insofar as they generate new knowledge or understanding through original research in response to questions and problems identified by commissioning agencies and/or have an identifiable impact on professional practice or applied policy fields, they can be seen to meet the DVC's guidelines on research, as outlined in the Active Research policy. These recognise the diverse nature of research conducted at UNSW, as a result of the University's focus on applied research.

The DVC's guidelines note that research may be considered scholarly if:

- a. it is the result of substantial scholarly activity
- b. it involves original work (i.e. not a compilation of existing works)
- c. its veracity, validity, or scholarly quality has been tested through a peer review process or similar process involving an assessment or review of the research output in its entirety by an independent qualified expert/s, or by satisfying the commercial publisher processes
- d. it contributes to increasing the stock of knowledge
- e. it is in a form that enables dissemination of knowledge.

Applicants from the SPRC and NCHVR will be expected to demonstrate that their research outputs meet these criteria.

TEACHING

According to the Academic Promotions Policy and Procedures, the teaching contributions of staff applying for promotion are to be considered in the context of 'what would be expected within the School [or Centre]' (p.7). Undergraduate teaching is not part of the regular duties of NCHSR and SPRC staff. The centres have varied levels of engagement with postgraduate coursework teaching, as outlined in the Centre Director's report on each candidate.

Many NCHSR and SPRC staff engage in extensive research training with community organizations, government departments and professional associations. They also undertake careful and structured mentoring of junior colleagues; this is an aspect of the team-based approach to research. They may also participate in internship programs involving senior undergraduates, Honours and HDR students from Australian and overseas universities. In the Centres where such programs exist, staff may offer close guidance of students in order to enhance research capacity and skills. Individuals will outline their contributions.

SUPERVISION OF HDR STUDENTS

Until recently, NCHSR and SPRC did not conduct their own higher degree by research programs. Accordingly, many of their staff will not have been in a position to develop a record of independent HDR research supervision. The absence of such a record should, therefore, be assessed relative to opportunity.

