

ROYAL HOLLOWAY

University of London

PROMOTION TO SENIOR LECTURER

1. Quotas are no longer applied to promotion to Senior Lectureships in the College. Promotion is approved purely on individual merit.
2. The Group reviews promotion proposals on the evidence from departments, the candidate's *curriculum vitae* (including the teaching profile [see [Appendices 1 and 2](#)] and publication list) and external referees reports about successful performance in the following areas:
 - (i) teaching, including curriculum development, examining and initiation of teaching methods;
 - (ii) scholarship and published research;
 - (iii) departmental, College and University administrative responsibilities and positive contribution to learned societies and other relevant external bodies;
 - (iv) other contributions, for example to continuing education, to policy making at a national or international level and to the developing of industrial and commercial links and contracts.

Detailed criteria are in the guidance which follows (*see [Appendix 3](#)*).

3. The Group does consider the over-all performance of candidates but for promotion to Senior Lecturer greater emphasis may be placed on **exceptional** performance in any two areas. Submissions should also state in which areas the strength of the proposal lies. It is expected that candidates will have performed **adequately** in all the other relevant areas. Factual evidence of achievement should be detailed. Regard should be had, in this context, to the areas in which the Head of Department has agreed the candidate should be concentrating, as reflected in the workload.
4. **The proposals should be prepared by the Departmental Promotions Committee in each Department or in groups of cognate Departments. These committees should review the cases of all members of staff eligible for promotion. They may consider interviewing potential candidates for promotion where they think this would be helpful. The appropriate Dean is a member of each committee in the Faculty, with the object of achieving consistency of standards in relation to the approved criteria. The intention should be to determine that only the strongest cases go forward to the Group from within the Faculty. The constitution of and process to be adopted by the Departmental Promotions Committee is attached to this document (*see [Appendix 5](#)*).**

5. **The grounds for the proposal must be clearly stated, and the form for the Academic Staff Review Group completed.**
6. Individual members of staff may put themselves forward for promotion, although before doing so they should discuss the matter with their Head of Department and the Dean of Faculty. The Group will invite the Head of Department to comment. The member of staff should submit a statement of self-assessment in each of the four categories of teaching, research, administration (departmental or College/University of London activities) and third stream and enterprise activity.
7. The Committee will seek advice as necessary from academic referees who it is expected will be as objective as possible. The Group may be wary of suggested names where there has been a close link with the candidate, such as PhD supervision, although it is recognised that in some circumstances these referees will be wholly appropriate. The Committee recognises that the advice of external referees is likely to be weighted to the research performance of the candidate and it is therefore particularly important that the grounds for promotion are clearly stated, as indicated in **paragraph 3, and that where the grounds are for performance in areas other than research particular attention should be given to the objective evidence provided.**

PUBLICATION OF OUTCOME

8. A final list of recommended promotions will be agreed in the second term or early in the third term. All promotions date from 1 August 2005.
9. The Review Group aims to give as much guidance as possible to individuals, usually through the Head of Department, about the reasons why a submission for promotion is unsuccessful and the Deans of Faculty are able to offer any advice about improving performance which the Group feels competent to give.
10. An individual who is dissatisfied with the outcome of the Review shall be able to appeal to the Chair of the Council, but only on the grounds of a defect in procedure.

August 2004