

Academic Staff Promotion Procedure

Section 1 - Purpose

(1) This Procedure collects and details all procedural aspects of the academic staff promotion process at Charles Sturt University (the University). All persons involved in the academic promotion process will refer to this document to ensure that policy and procedure are followed and identify whom they should consult should issues arise.

(2) This Procedure describes all management aspects of the process from inception to completion of academic promotions at the University.

Scope

(3) This Procedure applies to:

- a. academic staff of the University, who hold a fixed-term or continuing appointment in a full-time or fractional capacity at Level A, B, C, or D;
- b. supervisors of academic staff applying or intending to apply for promotion from schools, divisions, offices and centres;
- c. the Academic Staff Promotion Committee appropriate to the applicant's level; and
- d. staff involved in the administration of academic promotion applications and documentation.

Section 2 - Glossary

(4) Refer to the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#) for the glossary.

Section 3 - Policy

(5) Refer to the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#).

Section 4 - Procedures

Part A - General

(6) The process by which promotion applications are coordinated will be structured so that promotion decisions:

- a. are fair, equitable and timely;
- b. are based on a fair and evidence based assessment of merit relative to established academic disciplinary norms;
- c. maintain academic standards of the University, particularly in the quality of teaching, research, scholarship, creative activity and professional practice; and
- d. are consistent with the University interpretation of performance standards and the University mission.

(7) The Academic Staff Promotion Committee will have six sources of information - the application, supervisor statement, research report, teaching and learning report, teaching peer review report and reports of referees. An application will be assessed on demonstrated performance and evidence, using these sources.

(8) The principal basis for assessing the written application for promotion will be the applicant's achievements and performance at the level currently held.

(9) In addition to clause 8, the Academic Staff Promotion Committee will be looking for evidence of a career trajectory and so other career achievements will be taken into account.

(10) Continued and outstanding retrospective performance that is consistent with the level sought, contributes to the University's mission and demonstrates a prospective trajectory is rewarded in promotion processes. Promotion is not recognised as a prospective opportunity to demonstrate future capability following a successful promotion.

Application Focus

(11) Applicants for promotion must demonstrate using suitable evidence that they:

- a. possess relevant qualifications or establish equivalent standing;
- b. demonstrate commitment to the University's core values and core strategies;
- c. meet the academic achievement levels appropriate to the academic level to which promotion is sought; and
- d. have a reputation appropriate to the academic level to which promotion is sought by their contributions to the domains of influencing University, profession and/or community; promoting learning; and creating knowledge.

(12) The application must establish the case for promotion (i.e. my performance at my current level is outstanding or, putting it another way, I am currently performing consistently at the level to which I seek promotion) and provide the evidence that supports this case.

(13) An applicant must understand what constitutes excellent performance in their discipline and build the case for promotion by providing context to their achievements.

(14) An applicant should assume that no member of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee will be familiar with their work and issues of discipline norms (publication venues, quality measures, teaching approaches and measures, and service/engagement expectations and standards). This means that all information in the application must be contextualised.

(15) All claims and assertions must be supported by suitable evidence, and achievements must not be cited more than once. If publications are confidential due to commercial constraints, the applicant should ask the University for a Confidential Assessment.

University Core Values and Core Strategies

(16) One of the distinguishing features of academia traditionally has been adherence to a set of core values. These core values are:

- a. Insightful - Understanding people and the world;
- b. Inclusive - Stronger together;
- c. Impactful - Outcome driven; and
- d. Inspiring - Leading for the future.

(17) All applicants for academic staff promotion at all levels must demonstrate how their achievements contribute to the University's core values and core strategies.

Domains

(18) Applicants for promotion must demonstrate that they meet the appropriate standards (as specified in clauses 20-35 of this Procedure) for academic performance, academic reputation and academic leadership in the domains of influencing University, profession and/or community; promoting learning; and creating knowledge.

(19) Further information is provided in the [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines - Applicants](#) and [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#).

Academic Performance and Leadership

(20) The responsibilities of academic staff may vary according to the specific requirements of the University to meet its objectives, to different discipline requirements and/or to individual staff development.

(21) Charles Sturt University is committed to the Minimum Standards for Academic Levels. These minimum standards have been re-couched in terms of academic performance and academic reputation to provide more relevance and immediacy to career development processes at the University.

(22) An applicant for promotion must meet the Minimum Standards for Academic Performance and Leadership as appropriate to the academic level to which they seek promotion, as follows:

- a. LEVEL A: Work with the support and guidance from more senior academic staff and is expected to develop academic expertise with an increasing degree of autonomy; normally contribute to academic activities at the University, at a level appropriate to the skills and experience of the staff member; engage in academic activity appropriate to profession or discipline, whilst gaining increased autonomy, and undertake administration primarily relating to activities at the University; contribution to teaching primarily at undergraduate and graduate diploma level.
- b. LEVEL B: Undertake independent academic activity in a discipline or related area; in academic activity make an independent contribution through professional practice and expertise and coordinate and/or lead the activities of other staff, as appropriate to the discipline; normally contribute to teaching at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate level; engage in independent academic activities appropriate to profession or discipline with increasing independence and initiative; normally undertake administration primarily relating to activities at the University and may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities of and related administration for the coordination of an award program of the University.
- c. LEVEL C: In academic activities make original contributions, which expand knowledge or practice in the discipline; normally make a significant contribution to academic activities of an organisational unit or an interdisciplinary area at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate level; normally have responsibility for, and play a major role or provide a significant degree of leadership in academic activities relevant to the profession, discipline and/or community; and may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities of and related administration for the coordination of a large award program or a number of smaller award programs of the University or functional unit such as a research team in a priority area, a significant research facility or a teaching facility.
- d. LEVEL D: Undertake independent academic activity in discipline or related area; in academic activity make an independent contribution through professional practice and expertise and coordinate and/or lead the activities of other staff, as appropriate to the discipline; normally contribute to teaching at undergraduate, honours and postgraduate level; engage in independent academic activities appropriate to profession or discipline with increasing independence and initiative; normally undertake administration primarily relating to activities at the University; and may be required to perform the full academic responsibilities of and related administration for the coordination of an award program of the University.
- e. LEVEL E: Provide strong leadership and foster excellence in their academic discipline within the University and within the community, professional, commercial or industrial sectors; make original, innovative and

distinguished contributions to scholarship, researching and teaching in the discipline; make a commensurate contribution to the work of the University; expected to be able to evidence a contribution to the inclusive development of staff as agreed with the individual's line manager.

Academic Reputation and Leadership

(23) An academic must meet the Minimum Standards for Academic Reputation and Leadership as appropriate to the academic level, as identified below. National or international standing is, by definition, gained through activities that command respect nationally or internationally. Examples of such activities are provided in [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#).

- a. LEVEL A: Capacity to undertake, under supervision, teaching and/or research / creative works and/or professional activity; and the capacity to work as part of a team of academic staff.
- b. LEVEL B: Record of research / creative works or professional activity relevant to the discipline area, which demonstrates a capacity to make an autonomous contribution.
- c. LEVEL C: Record of significant achievement and outputs relevant to the discipline area, and with recognition of impact external to the institution.
- d. LEVEL D: Record of academic achievement and outputs of national and/or international standing through outstanding contributions, including academic leadership.
- e. LEVEL E: Record of academic achievement and outputs of national and international standing through distinguished contributions, including academic leadership recognition as an eminent authority in the discipline, including academic leadership.

(24) The minimum standards for academic performance and academic reputation at the different appointment levels are differentiated by:

- a. level of complexity;
- b. degree of autonomy;
- c. leadership requirements of the position; and
- d. level of achievement of the academic.

(25) The minimum standards for each level assume that requirements for all lower levels are met.

Qualifications and/or Equivalent Status

(26) In addition to relevant professional experience, applicants must demonstrate that they meet the minimum qualifications for appointment or promotion to the various levels of staff appointment:

- a. LEVEL A: An honours degree or higher qualification; an extended professional degree; a postgraduate diploma appropriate to the relevant discipline area; or equivalent accreditation and standing;
- b. LEVEL B: A doctoral or research masters qualification appropriate to the relevant discipline area or equivalent accreditation and standing;
- c. LEVEL C: A doctoral qualification relevant to the discipline area; or equivalent accreditation and standing;
- d. LEVEL D: A doctoral qualification relevant to the discipline area; or equivalent accreditation and standing;
- e. LEVEL E: A doctoral qualification relevant to the discipline area; or equivalent accreditation and standing.

Establishing a Case for Equivalent Accreditation and Standing (where Necessary)

(27) It is essential that applicants who do not hold the relevant doctoral or masters qualifications explicitly make the case for equivalent accreditation and standing. Failure to do so will mean that their application will be unsuccessful.

(28) Whilst explicitly acknowledging the diversity that typifies its academic staff, the normal expectation at the University is that Teaching and Research staff will hold a research doctoral qualification (although an honours degree is acceptable at Level A and a research master's qualification is acceptable at Level B). However, it is entirely consistent with the University's mission to recognise professional practice-based achievement for the purpose of equivalence in career development. This is based on recognition that some disciplines require a combination of qualifications, experience and registration to achieve expert-level professional standards.

(29) The usual route to higher levels of appointment (Levels D and E) will remain the holding of a doctoral qualification and achievements in influencing University, profession and/or community; promoting learning; and creating knowledge.

(30) An appropriate level of achievement is required across each of the domains aligned with each individual's appointment, as expanded in clauses 18-25 of this Procedure.

(31) For staff whose appointment type does not include a research work function, a level of achievement in research is not a mandatory requirement for promotion. The norm is that a member of the academic staff whose prime focus is teaching demonstrates that their contribution is underpinned by outstanding scholarship that must be linked to the nature of the individual's appointment.

(32) In deciding equivalent accreditation and standing:

- a. where an examining body, profession or similar institute admits a person to one of its awards or levels of membership such as Fellowship or Diplomate (typically by examination and research), and that award or level of membership is widely considered by universities and the profession to be equivalent to a particular level of University award, then the award or level of membership may be deemed to have equivalent standing to the particular University award for purposes of career development;
- b. it is the responsibility of the applicant to provide details of the basis on which awards and membership have been determined, and the standing they confer within the relevant field; and
- c. where a professional doctorate is equivalent to an Australian Qualifications Framework Level 10 qualification, then it is deemed to have equivalent standing to the doctoral qualification for purposes of career development.

(33) In all other instances the following shall apply:

- a. for equivalent standing to a master's degree, an applicant will demonstrate:
 - i. sustained achievement in professional development activities; and
 - ii. advanced knowledge and achievement across a significant portion of their field of expertise; or
 - iii. detailed knowledge and achievement in a particular part of their field.
- b. for equivalent standing to a doctoral degree, an applicant will demonstrate:
 - i. sustained achievement in professional development activities;
 - ii. broad knowledge and achievement across their field of expertise; and
 - iii. in-depth knowledge and achievement in a particular part of their field.

(34) The option of demonstrating equivalence is normally restricted to those engaged in professional practice and where the current norm is not to hold a doctoral or master's qualification. In determining equivalent standing there is no distinction between appointment levels, i.e. the same standard for doctoral equivalence applies at Level C as at Level E.

(35) It is not possible to set an absolute standard; there must be some flexibility. For example, there are a number of individuals who have excelled to the highest level of achievement without a doctoral qualification, including some Australian Nobel Laureates.

Interviews

(36) Applicants for promotion will not be required to meet with the Academic Staff Promotion Committee. However, they will be asked to provide a contact phone number as part of their application and to be available at the time the Committee meets should the Committee require clarification of aspects of their application.

Part B - Referees

(37) The University will seek three written referee reports for each applicant for academic promotion. An application presented to the Academic Staff Promotion Committee must include a minimum of two referee reports to be considered complete.

(38) When advising their primary supervisor of an intent to apply for academic promotion, an applicant should:

- a. provide the names of potential referees who
 - i. can comment effectively on the quality, impact and standing of their work;
 - ii. meet the requirements set out in clauses 42-45 of this Procedure; and
 - iii. reasons why they were recommended.
- b. provide the names of up to four individuals who they do not wish to assess their application and the reasons why; and
- c. should discuss potential referees with their supervisor.

(39) It is the responsibility of the applicant to declare any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest or any personal or professional connection between the applicant and a suggested referee that may prejudice the independence of the referee.

(40) The primary supervisor of the applicant:

- a. will discuss potential referees with the applicant and clearly articulate why and how referees will be chosen;
- b. will select referees in accordance with Part B of this Procedure;
- c. must make the initial selection of referees in consultation with the applicant and can also involve other University members of the applicant's academic discipline or cognate discipline;
- d. is responsible for providing the Division of Human Resources with the names and contact details of three individuals who have agreed to act as referees no later than 31 July; and
- e. must not inform the applicant of the final selection of referees.

(41) In nominating referees, the primary supervisor should consider the following:

- a. The most important considerations in choosing referees are credibility, independence and objectivity. What is the status of the referee and what is their ability to provide independent, knowledgeable or informed and unbiased commentary on the applicant's work?
- b. Two questions are worth considering: Is there any way in which the referee might appear to bring bias to their assessment? Answers such as occupying the next door office, member of the same school, power imbalance in favour of the applicant, etc. could indicate potential bias. The second question is simply a re-wording of the first: Is there any way in which the credibility of this referee could be questioned? If the answer is yes, due for example to close collaboration, then in both cases the person should only be chosen where a good case can be mounted for using this particular referee.
- c. The choice of four referees from a single country with which an applicant has a close association would not necessarily demonstrate international standing.
- d. Where referees are chosen for professional expertise or their role in industry or government, referees selected

should have an appreciation and understanding of academia and the academic framework and the need for their report to be analytic and not a simple letter of support.

(42) Nomination of referees for applicants applying for promotion will be in accordance with the following:

- a. with the exception of Level E, nominated referees must hold an appointment higher than the level to which the applicant is seeking promotion;
- b. promotion to Level B - at least one of the referees must be external to the University and preferably be acknowledged as a national or international authority in their discipline area;
- c. promotion to Level C, a supervisor may nominate one referee internal to the University but all three referees must be of at least national standing in a relevant discipline;
- d. promotion to Level D, referees must be of at least national standing in a relevant discipline. Referees internal to the University would be considered inappropriate unless of special standing; and
- e. promotion to Level E, referees must be of international standing in a relevant discipline. Referees internal to the University would be considered inappropriate.

(43) Former staff of Charles Sturt University are regarded as internal if they left the University's employment in the previous five years.

(44) Referees selected:

- a. cannot be members of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee, the applicant's Executive Dean or other senior member of the University;
- b. should be familiar with the applicant's academic and professional work and able to provide an objective, independent, clear and authoritative assessment of that work and the quality of the performance of the applicant;
- c. will attest to the quality, impact and standing of the achievements and associated evidence stated within the application.

(45) Referees chosen for professional expertise or their role in industry or in government will need to clearly establish their standing in the report.

Part C - Applicants

Support of Applicants in Preparing for Promotion

(46) The University regards promotion as recognition and reward for sustained outstanding performance at the existing level of appointment, and provides support to staff to maximise their opportunity for success.

(47) Support mechanisms provided for applicants include provision of information sessions (also available online), online resources and a formal academic mentor.

(48) Mentors will be drawn from the pool of successful promotion applicants. Staff suited to this mentoring role will have been identified by the Division of Human Resources and provided with training by the division as necessary.

Preparing for a Promotion Application

(49) Prior to commencing an application for promotion, applicants should ensure that they have:

- a. read and understood the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#), Procedure and Applicant Guidelines and confirmed their eligibility to apply;

- b. read the associated University policies to determine the basis for their application for academic promotion;
- c. discussed their intention to apply with their supervisor at their annual Employee Development and Review Scheme meeting;
- d. familiarised themselves with the support provided by the University and attended annual staff information sessions to understand the process of academic staff promotion;
- e. formally notified their supervisor by 30 April that they will be applying for promotion that year;
- f. formally notified the Division of Human Resources of an intention to apply for academic promotion that year;
- g. gathered evidence to support their application;
- h. considered ways in which to demonstrate continual growth as an academic, especially their future capacity to contribute at the academic level to which promotion is sought; and
- i. in accordance with Part B of this procedure select and discuss a pool of suitable referees with their primary supervisor.

Application for Promotion

(50) In completing an application for promotion, applicants:

- a. must observe the content limits and formatting as specified in the [Academic Staff Promotion - Application](#) Form;
- b. are responsible for ensuring compliance with all relevant policy and procedural issue;
- c. are to complete their application, adhering to all requirements in the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#), Procedure and [Academic Staff Promotion - Application](#) Form;
- d. must provide the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee with a clearly articulated written case for promotion to the academic level sought; and
- e. should refer to the information contained in the [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines - Applicants](#).

(51) Applicants for promotion must satisfy qualification requirements or demonstrate equivalence to be promoted. This is the only absolute standard. With this exception all other standards must be considered holistically and interpreted in light of the applicant's work function and assigned percentages to the three domains recognised by the University.

(52) In addition to relevant professional experience, applicants must demonstrate that they meet the minimum qualifications for appointment or promotion to the various levels of staff appointment in accordance with clause 18 of this Procedure.

(53) Where the applicant is a member of a University Research Centre but the Centre Director is not the supervisor, there is provision for the University Research Centre Director to provide comment as part of the supervisor's report.

(54) The completed application is to be submitted to the applicant's supervisor and University Research Centre Director (where appropriate) by 31 July. The supervisor (and Centre Director, if relevant) must complete the supervisor statement (Part 9b) and return the application to the applicant by 24 August. In the event that an applicant has more than one supervisor, all supervisors must provide a supervisor statement by the due date.

(55) An applicant's supervisor is required to attest to the accuracy of factual claims made in the application. It is the applicant's responsibility to show the supervisor/s supporting documentation and evidence to facilitate this process.

Submission of the Application

(56) The completed application for academic promotion, including the supervisor statement, is to be received by the Division of Human Resources by 31 August. Late applications will not be accepted.

(57) The Division of Human Resources will provide confirmation of application receipt. Applicants should retain this

confirmation for their records.

(58) An applicant retains the right to submit a promotion application in the event that the application is not supported by the supervisor/supervisors.

(59) Applicant may withdraw their application at any time prior to the convening of the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

Part D - Supervisors

(60) The supervisor/s play a key role in all stages of an applicant's promotion, particularly in assisting and advising applicants in the preparation of their application and assisting all Academic Staff Promotion Committees in their deliberations to reach a fair and equitable decision. Whilst the supervisor is responsible for provision of advice to the applicant in the preparation of application, the supervisor does not play an advocacy role in reporting to the Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(61) The primary supervisor will select referees, in accordance with Part B – Referees of this Procedure.

(62) The primary supervisor, with the assistance of the Division of Human Resources, will identify one or more suitable mentors for the applicant and ensure that the mentoring process is occurring.

(63) Supervisors and academic mentors will be trained and equipped to give consistent and accurate informed advice to applicants. It is expected that the supervisor will attend training and information sessions provided.

(64) An applicant's supervisor, in consultation with the supervisor's direct line manager (typically the Head of School and Executive Dean respectively), will play a strong role in providing advice and comment on the quality of the application, whether the application builds a compelling case for promotion and, where appropriate, shows significance external to the institution, nationally or internationally beyond the school, faculty and University level.

(65) An applicant's supervisor should engage in discussions with their direct line manager for advice in cases where there is uncertainty regarding the applicant's readiness for promotion.

(66) The supervisor will consult with their line manager in relation to completion of the supervisor statement for each applicant.

(67) Supervisors should ensure that the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee is notified of any achievements advised and deemed significant by the applicant between the time of the application submission and the relevant committee meeting.

(68) The supervisor will be involved in the provision of feedback to both successful and unsuccessful applicants and in assisting applicants to implement any actions from the feedback specifically:

- a. Applicants need to understand that, regardless of the outcome, their work is valued; and
- b. applicants who are unsuccessful should be supported. They may be very disappointed, and will need clear feedback and assistance about how to:
 - i. improve their application - therefore, consideration might be given to linking the unsuccessful applicant with a mentor to review the quality and composition of their application; and/or
 - ii. identify where further development is needed to demonstrate capacity to meet the next level's standards. Plans should be made by the supervisor to assist with career objectives and professional development.

(69) Supervisors of an applicant for academic promotion must:

- a. review the applicant's application for promotion;
- b. complete Part 9b (Statement by Supervisor) within the application;
- c. return the application to the applicant by 24 August; and
- d. discuss the supervisor statement with the applicant, providing appropriate feedback.

(70) Where the applicant is a member of a University Research Centre but the Centre Director is not the supervisor, there is provision for the University Research Centre Director to provide comment as part of the supervisor's statement.

(71) To review the application effectively, supervisors must:

- a. familiarise themselves with the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#), Procedure, [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines - Applicants](#) as well as other associated policies and [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#);
- b. familiarise themselves with the applicant's work, specifically achievements and capacities in relation to the requirements defined by [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#) for the academic level sought;
- c. familiarise themselves with disciplinary expectations and/or standards relevant to the applicant;
- d. read the application carefully. Applications must adhere to the page/character limits and standard formats specified in the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#) and Procedure. Chances of success are limited if applications are poorly constructed, punctuated and/or written;
- e. assess the applicant against relevant standards; and
- f. view and verify any documents and supporting evidence referred to in the application as there is no provision for attachments.

(72) The supervisor statement must address how the applicant meets the University's standards as contained in clauses 18-35 of this Procedure. The statement:

- a. should verify the currency of the work function description;
- b. must attest to the accuracy of factual claims made in the application. This includes but is not restricted to teaching duties, teaching surveys, peer reviews of teaching, and the role of the applicant in collaborative outputs. It is the responsibility of the applicant to show the supervisor supporting documentation to facilitate this process (e.g. documented citation indices, contact details for co-authors or committee Chairs). The supervisor may contact co-authors of research outputs and co-awardees of research grants or committee Chairs where necessary to establish the applicant's role in the process;
- c. should indicate whether and how the applicant provides leadership, and support for developing scholarship in the school or University Research Centre.
- d. include a disciplinary statement alerting the Academic Staff Promotion Committee to relevant discipline norms to aid the Committee's understanding/interpretation of the data presented to it within the application. For example, explaining what the data means when comparing matters such as teaching scores.
- e. should be both current and prospective, and refer to:
 - i. the applicant's capacity to meet the standards for the academic level sought;
 - ii. the evidence provided, such as probation reports, examiner's reports, teaching portfolios, teaching evaluation reports, referee reports, citation indices, research/creative works and/or professional activity records, and outcomes from administrative, committee or leadership activities (including mentoring or collaboration);
 - iii. any additional information which may help the Committee assess the application; and
- f. state whether the application for promotion is supported. Where the supervisor supports the applicant for promotion but feels that the application is inadequate, this should be noted in the supervisor statement.

Part E - Committee

Academic Staff Promotion Committees

(73) An Academic Staff Promotion Committee has one task - to use the evidence presented to it to determine whether an applicant's application for promotion meets requirements and standards for promotion to the level sought.

(74) In assessing an application for promotion the Committee must:

- a. look objectively at the information presented in the application and supporting documentation (supervisor's report, research report, learning and teaching report and referee reports) for evidence of sustained contributions at the levels claimed and measure performance against a set of pre-determined standards;
- b. allow for the differences in percentage weightings assigned to the three domains recognised by the University. For example, an applicant who assigns an 80% weighting to the Creating Knowledge domain, and is supported by their supervisor, must be held to a higher standard than an individual assigning a 30% weighting to the same domain: and
- c. be aware of the importance of disciplinary context.

(75) There are two levels of Academic Staff Promotion Committees: the Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee and the University Professorial Promotion Committee.

Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee Membership

(76) A committee will be established by each faculty to meet annually face-to-face (where possible) to consider applications to Lecturer (Level B) and Senior Lecturer (Level C). Each Academic Staff Promotion Committee will have the following membership:

- a. the relevant Executive Dean ex officio as Chair;
- b. the Presiding Officer, Academic Senate ex officio;
- c. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) ex officio;
- d. the Pro Vice-Chancellor Global Engagement (Research and Partnerships) ex officio;
- e. four members of academic staff and approved by the Executive Dean who on 31 August:
 - i. hold a substantive appointment at Level C or above with two holding substantive appointments at Level D or E and all nominated and approved by the Executive Dean ; at least two of these members must be research active;
 - ii. are from different schools within the faculty but not necessarily representing all schools; and
 - iii. do not hold an appointment as Executive Dean, Associate Dean, Deputy Dean, Head of School or equivalent.
- f. two members of academic staff nominated and approved by the Executive Dean who on 31 August:
 - i. hold a substantive appointment at Level C or above;
 - ii. are from outside the faculty and from different faculties; and
 - iii. who do not hold an appointment as an Executive Dean or Head of School.

(77) If in exceptional circumstances there are no available individuals of the under-represented gender, the Executive Dean will notify the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) who will confirm the composition of the Committee.

(78) In selecting nominated staff, the Chair of the Committee must ensure the Committee has as close to equal gender representation as reasonably practicable, with a minimum of one-third representation of each gender. Gender balance can be facilitated by the Executive Dean's selection of nominees. Careful consideration should be given in appointing nominees to cover the breadth of disciplinary expertise in the faculty and the range of skills in research, scholarship,

teaching and professional practice.

(79) An applicant's supervisor (e.g. Head of School) has right of audience ONLY (but not debate) on all Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee. To facilitate feedback to applicants by the Executive Dean and/or the relevant supervisor, the supervisor will attend the commencement of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee meeting and during discussions of applicants from their school/section.

(80) The recommendations of the Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee will be referred to the Executive Dean for approval. In making a determination, the Executive Dean will not be bound by the recommendations of the Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(81) Nominated internal members of Academic Staff Promotion Committees are to serve a two-year term with staggered rotation of one half of the nominated members to ensure continuity of committee membership.

(82) A representative of the Executive Director, Human Resources will attend the Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committees. The role of the representative is to provide expert advice to the Committee, with particular attention to adherence to the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#) and Procedure, issues of fairness and equity, and any people management implications.

University Professorial Promotion Committee Membership

(83) This committee will be established by the Division of Human Resources to meet annually face-to-face to assess and recommend applications for promotion to Associate Professor (Level D) and Professor (Level E). The University Professorial Promotion Committee will have the following membership:

- a. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) ex officio as Chair;
- b. the Presiding Officer, Academic Senate ex officio;
- c. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry) ex officio;
- d. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) ex officio;
- e. four members of academic staff nominated and approved by the Vice-Chancellor who on 31 August hold a substantive appointment at Level E and:
 - i. cover each of the University's faculties;
 - ii. at least two members must be research active;
 - iii. at least one member must have significant expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning; and
 - iv. are not an Executive Dean, Associate Dean, Deputy Dean, Head of School or equivalent.
- f. up to three senior academics from another university nominated by the Vice-Chancellor; at least one must have expertise in the scholarship of teaching and learning; and
- g. in the absence of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry) ex officio, will undertake the role of Chair.

(84) In selecting nominated staff, the Vice-Chancellor must ensure the Committee has as close to equal gender representation as reasonably practicable, with a minimum of one-third representation of each gender. Gender balance can be facilitated by the Vice-Chancellor's selection of nominees. Careful consideration should be given in appointing nominees to cover breadth of disciplinary expertise in the University and the range of skills in research, scholarship, teaching and professional practice.

(85) If in exceptional circumstances there are no available individuals of the under-represented gender, the Vice-Chancellor will document the problem and include details in the report to Academic Senate.

(86) Executive Deans, Deans and Pro Vice-Chancellor have automatic right of audience and debate on the University Professorial Promotion Committee for applicants from their faculty, office, centre or division only.

(87) An applicant's supervisor (e.g. Heads of School) has the right of audience ONLY (but not debate) on the Professorial Academic Staff Promotion Committee. The supervisor will attend commencement of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee meeting and during discussions of applicants from their school/section.

(88) An Executive Dean, Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor may, upon invitation of the Chair of the University Professorial Promotion Committee, act as a voting committee member where:

- a. an existing voting committee member has declared a conflict of interest or is not available to vote in relation to an application for promotion under consideration;
- b. the Executive Dean, Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor is not the direct supervisor; and/or
- c. the applicant is outside the faculty, office, centre or division of the Executive Dean, Dean or Pro Vice-Chancellor.

(89) Nominated internal members of the University Professorial Promotion Committee are to serve a two-year term with staggered rotation of one half of the nominated members to ensure continuity of committee membership.

(90) A representative of the Executive Director, Human Resources will attend the University Professorial Promotion Committee. The role of the representative is to provide expert advice to the Committee, with particular attention to adherence to the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#) and Procedure, issues of fairness and equity, and any people management implications.

Conflict of Interest

(91) In the case of a conflict of interest being identified by a member of an Academic Staff Promotion Committee, this must be notified to the Presiding Officer of the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee who will investigate and take the necessary action. If time permits this may include a replacement committee member for the consideration of that application or exclusion of the member from the meeting during consideration of that application.

Training for Committee Members

(92) Induction and training will be offered to all members of the Academic Staff Promotion Committees. All committee members will be provided with an information pack.

(93) Training is to include but not be limited to:

- a. aspects of the roles and responsibilities that are incurred as members of an Academic Staff Promotion Committee;
- b. statutory requirements involving equity and confidentiality;
- c. promotion procedures at the University, highlighting any differences to other institutions;
- d. conflict of interest;
- e. impact of disciplinary differences;
- f. collaboration and team work, multiple authorship and differences between publishing protocols;
- g. citation indices, impact factors and benchmarking data; and
- h. different ways, both quantitative and qualitative, of assessing the range of academic activities referred to as domains and dimensions.

Assessing an Application for Promotion

(94) An application for promotion will be assessed against the evidence provided through:

- a. the detailed record of the academic achievements of the applicant (what the applicant has done, the outcomes

relative to standards for the relevant level of appointment, impact of the outcomes and supporting evidence), addressing the type of evidence specified by [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#);

- b. a statement(s) by the supervisor and University Centre Director (if relevant);
- c. the response of the applicant to the supervisor statement(s) (optional);
- d. research reports;
- e. learning and teaching reports;
- f. teaching peer reviews;
- g. referee reports; and
- h. additional referee reports, if required.

(95) Where an Academic Staff Promotion Committee deems the applicant to have submitted an incomplete application, the Committee will:

- a. note the omission for inclusion in feedback to the applicant; and
- b. assess the application on the documentation available.

(96) Prior to the meeting of the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee, each member of the Committee is to assess all applications using the template supplied by the Division of Human Resources.

(97) The completed template must be submitted by committee members to the Division of Human Resources three working days prior to the scheduled meeting of the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(98) The Presiding Officer of each Academic Staff Promotion Committee is responsible for ensuring that the Committee:

- a. meets face-to-face in the case of the University Professorial Promotion Committee and face-to-face where possible in the case of Faculty Academic Staff Promotion Committee;
- b. is properly constituted, including compliance with gender requirements; and
- c. consistently applies fair and proper procedures to the consideration of each application. During the Committee discussions, matters of opinion must be substantiated and any comments or questions should relate specifically to the established standards specified in clauses 20-35 of this Procedure.

(99) At the commencement of the meeting, the Presiding Officer will:

- a. confirm matters relating to record keeping for the meeting to ensure that clear records are kept of the Committee's discussions in order to provide feedback to both successful and unsuccessful applicants;
- b. confirm the need to maintain confidentiality regarding the Committee's proceedings;
- c. brief the Committee on its role, and processes;
- d. discuss with the Committee the standards defined in clauses 20-35 of this Procedure for the different academic levels to ensure that the Committee operates with a shared understanding; and
- e. confirm the Committee's understanding of Equal Employment Opportunity principles in relation to promotion. Equal Employment Opportunity means that employment policies and practices must be based on the principle of merit. Therefore, applications for promotion must be considered on the basis of the applicant's merit, unbiased by personal opinion or prejudice; and
- f. establish an order of proceedings. Matters that must be addressed are the sequence in which applications will be reviewed and the rules governing the order in which committee members will speak to each application. The Presiding Officer will select a minimum of three committee members to speak to each application.

(100) All Academic Staff Promotion Committees will discuss each applicant's application.

(101) Committees may contact an applicant during the course of committee deliberations to clarify aspects of their application.

(102) As well as the referees nominated by the supervisor, the Academic Staff Promotion Committees may seek the opinions of additional referees within the applicant's particular discipline. Additional referees sought by Academic Staff Promotion Committees must meet the eligibility requirements defined in Clauses 42 to 45 under Part B of this Procedure.

(103) In making a decision, a committee member must also consider the performance trajectory of the applicant over time. The Committee is interested in the total case for promotion and not the attainment of performance metrics alone. Thus, the Committee will consider the quality and impact of achievements and the standing of the applicant appropriate to the level sought, using the evidence supplied by the applicant and any report from the supervisor and the referee reports, not merely the achievement of quantitative thresholds.

Recommendations

(104) At the completion of all debate of an individual application, the Presiding Officer of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee will organise for a vote to be taken by ballot of all members of the Committee eligible to vote.

(105) All decisions must be based on the merits of the application against the relevant standards contained in [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#). The final recommendation of each committee member will be informed by the individual assessments BUT the final decision must be determined holistically with due consideration of the presentation by the applicant (where relevant) and by the debate of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee and not simply by an average of the individual assessments.

(106) A committee decision to support promotion of an applicant will require a majority vote of 65% of the number of committee members eligible to vote (rounded up to the nearest whole number).

(107) In cases where the vote in favour of promotion falls short of the required 65% but exceeds 50%, the applicant should be given the opportunity to submit a new application the following year. This condition does not preclude this consideration from being extended to other applicants.

(108) The advice to be provided by an Academic Staff Promotion Committee to the Presiding Officer on individual applications is to be discussed and agreed upon by the Committee.

(109) All Academic Staff Promotion Committees will make a recommendation for or against promotion on each application, using the approved form, to the Presiding Officer of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(110) All relevant documentation used in Academic Staff Promotion Committees should be returned to the Secretary, Academic Staff Promotion Committees at the end of the Committee meetings and retained in accordance with legislative requirements.

(111) The Presiding Officer of each Academic Staff Promotion Committee will make known to the Division of Human Resources the recommendations of the Committee within three working days of receiving the recommendations.

(112) The recommendations of the University Professorial Promotion Committee will be referred to the Vice-Chancellor for approval. In making a determination, the Vice-Chancellor will not be bound by the recommendations of the University Professorial Promotion Committee.

Extraordinary Promotion Committees

(113) To assist the University in achieving its key objectives, and to retain high quality academic staff who are continuing to make an outstanding and exceptional contribution to the University's mission, nothing in this Procedure

shall prevent the establishment of an ad hoc Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee outside the normal annual round of promotions to make a recommendation on the promotion of an academic staff member.

(114) Written submissions to establish an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee may be made to the Vice-Chancellor by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) on the advice of the relevant Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor or Centre Director. Following consideration of such a submission, the Vice-Chancellor may decide to establish an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(115) The membership of an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee established to consider a submission to promote an employee to Level B or Level C will comprise:

- a. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) - Presiding Officer, ex officio;
- b. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry) ex officio;
- c. the Presiding Officer, Academic Senate ex officio;
- d. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) ex officio;
- e. one of the Level E employees, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor in the immediately preceding annual round of promotions. The appointment of this member will be at the discretion of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic); and
- f. up to three members of the professoriate nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) who are external to the relevant faculty and who have previously served as a member of a University Professorial Promotion Committee.

(116) The membership of an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee established to consider a submission to promote an employee to Level D or E will comprise:

- a. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) - Presiding Officer, ex officio;
- b. the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry) ex officio;
- c. the Presiding Officer, Academic Senate ex officio;
- d. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching) ex officio;
- e. one of the Level E employees, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor in the immediately preceding annual round of promotions. The appointment of this member will be at the discretion of the Vice-Chancellor; and
- f. up to three persons external to the University, nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.

(117) Every effort shall be made to achieve gender balance and diversity of membership on Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committees. As a minimum, an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee will normally have in its membership at least one male and one female.

(118) The Executive Dean of the applicant's faculty will be invited to address the Committee about the submission.

(119) A representative of the Executive Director, Human Resources will attend the Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee. The role of the representative is to provide expert advice to the Committee, with particular attention to adherence to the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#) and Procedure, issues of fairness and equity, and any people management implications.

(120) The material to be considered by an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee, and the procedures of this committee, will be similar to the material considered and procedures adopted by the other applicable Academic Staff Promotion Committees established under the provisions of this Procedure.

(121) The Presiding Officer may approve the recommendations of the Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee and, where applicable, report such decisions to the University Council. The Presiding Officers shall not be bound by the recommendations of an Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(122) The circumstances and outcomes of the Extraordinary Academic Staff Promotion Committees will be reported annually to Academic Senate by the Vice-Chancellor at the time of the annual academic promotions report.

Part F - Notification of Determination

(123) The Executive Director, Human Resources or nominee will phone each applicant and provide notification in writing of the outcome of the application within two working days of receipt of determinations from the Presiding Officer or Vice-Chancellor.

Part G - Applicant Feedback

(124) Formal constructive feedback may be provided either face-to-face or by videoconference.

(125) Feedback is to be provided within 20 working days of formal written notification to applicants of the outcome of their application for promotion.

(126) All feedback provided to applicants will focus on information collected during the Committee's deliberations.

(127) Unsuccessful applicants will be advised whether the level of attainment did not meet the standards for the level sought; and/or whether the evidence supporting the achievement was insufficient; and of:

- a. the area(s) of academic activity in which the Committee believed there were insufficient data to support the promotion;
- b. strengths against the characteristics set out in [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#); and
- c. areas in need of improvement and suggestions for future development if the Executive Dean recommends they apply for promotion in the following year.

(128) After completion of the feedback session, the applicant (successful and unsuccessful) must notify the Division of Human Resources that official feedback has been provided and that they understand that this feedback forms part of their career development rather than a prescriptive list of future requirements.

(129) Future career development processes such as the Employee Development and Review Scheme will not be deemed satisfactory until this is completed.

Applications for Promotion to Levels B - C

(130) The supervisor and the supervisor's line manager (e.g. Head of School and Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor or equivalent) are responsible for collectively providing formal constructive feedback to each unsuccessful applicant about their application for promotion to Levels B and C.

(131) An applicant's supervisor, being Head of School or equivalent, is responsible for providing formal constructive feedback to each successful applicant about their application for promotion to Levels B and C.

Applications for Promotion to Levels D-E

(132) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and/or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry) together with the Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor or equivalent are responsible for providing formal constructive feedback to each unsuccessful applicant about their application for promotion to Levels D and E.

(133) In addition to clause 132, the applicant's supervisor is required to attend the feedback session. This will enable the supervisor to understand any identified gaps and work with the applicant to address those gaps through the performance development and review process.

(134) The Executive Dean/Pro Vice-Chancellor or equivalent together with the applicant's supervisor are responsible for providing formal constructive feedback to each successful applicant about their application for promotion to Levels D and E.

(135) In addition to clause 134, an applicant successful in promotion to Level D or E may seek further feedback from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) and/or Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research, Development and Industry). However, provision of such feedback may be outside the 20 days specified in clause 124.

Part H - Appeals

(136) An employee may only appeal on the grounds that a breach of fair and proper procedures was committed, which materially and adversely affected a decision about promotion. An appeal cannot be lodged against a decision relating to the academic merit of the employee's application for promotion.

(137) "Fair and proper procedures" means that:

- a. the appellant's application for promotion was made available to all members of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee;
- b. all members of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee were given the opportunity to comment on, and contribute to, the assessment of the appellant's application for promotion; and
- c. the appellant's application for promotion was considered against the criteria in the [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#).

(138) It is not grounds for appeal that an Academic Staff Promotion Committee did not:

- a. keep a record of its discussions or interview the appellant. It is sufficient that an Academic Staff Promotion Committee kept a record of the meeting, including its membership, the vote taken and its recommendations;
- b. include a member from the appellant's discipline; or
- c. examine documentation and material presented by the appellant, additional to that required in the Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

Appeal submission

(139) An unsuccessful applicant has 20 working days from the date of the formal notification in writing within which to lodge an appeal in writing to the Secretary, Academic Staff Promotion Committees for determination by the Vice-Chancellor.

(140) In lodging an appeal, the employee must provide prima facie evidence to substantiate the ground(s) on which the appeal is made.

(141) Where, in the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor, such evidence has not been provided, the appeal shall not proceed and the employee shall be promptly advised of this in writing.

(142) Where, in the opinion of the Vice-Chancellor, such evidence has been provided, the Vice-Chancellor will hear and determine the appeal within 10 working days of receipt of the appellant's evidence.

Determination of the appeal

(143) The Vice-Chancellor's terms of reference are to determine:

- a. whether an Academic Staff Promotion Committee committed a breach in respect to the ground(s) for appeal specified in clause 136 of this Procedure; and

- b. if a breach was committed by an Academic Staff Promotion Committee, whether that breach may have significantly and detrimentally affected a decision on the appellant's application for promotion.

(144) The Vice-Chancellor is not empowered to review or decide the academic merit of an appellant's application for promotion.

(145) The Vice-Chancellor may seek additional information relevant to its terms of reference, but shall not take into account additional or new material supplementing the original application for promotion.

(146) After considering an appeal against the procedures of an Academic Staff Promotion Committee, the Vice-Chancellor shall either reject or uphold the appeal. The Vice-Chancellor's decision shall be final and not subject to review or change.

(147) The Vice-Chancellor shall provide the appellant with a report setting out the decision and the reasons for the decision.

Reconsideration of an application

(148) Where the Vice-Chancellor upholds an appeal, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or relevant Executive Dean shall reconvene the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee to reconsider the appellant's application for promotion within 10 working days of their receipt of the Vice-Chancellor's report.

(149) Following reconsideration of the appellant's application for promotion by the reconvened committee, the Presiding Officer shall submit a report to the Vice-Chancellor, setting out the Committee's recommendation and the reason(s) for the recommendation.

(150) The decision of the Vice-Chancellor, on the recommendation of the reconvened committee, shall be final and the University Secretary shall promptly advise the applicant in writing of the Vice-Chancellor's decision concerning the appeal.

Part I - Administration

(151) Supervisors will be invited to attend a briefing from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to discuss the current expectations of their role in the promotion process. They will also be informed of any changes to the promotions process that may have occurred as a result of review of the previous year's process.

(152) The Division of Human Resources will assist supervisors to identify one or more suitable mentors for the applicant and ensure that the mentoring process is occurring.

(153) The Division of Human Resources is responsible for providing induction and training to all members of the Academic Staff Promotion Committees in accordance with clause 93 of this Procedure.

(154) The Division of Human Resources will call for applications in March of each year.

(155) Applications for academic promotions will close on 31 August each year.

(156) The Division of Human Resources will not accept late applications.

(157) The Division of Human Resources will advise the applicant that their submission has been received and to retain a record of this confirmation.

(158) The Division of Human Resources will advise the applicant of the date of the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee meeting.

(159) The Division of Human Resources is responsible for contacting nominated referees to request the submission of signed referee reports. Referees must be supplied with a full copy of the application, plus the University's [Academic Staff Promotion Policy](#), Procedure, [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines - Applicants](#) and access to all other relevant material (e.g. [The CSU Academic: A Guide to Evidence in Promotion](#)).

(160) Referee reports are to be received by the Secretary, Academic Staff Promotion Committees, academicpromotions@csu.edu.au no later than 20 September.

(161) The Division of Human Resources will collate applications and referee reports for all applicants and distribute applications to the relevant Academic Staff Promotion Committee members.

(162) Executive Deans, who have the right of audience and debate at the University Professorial Promotion Committee, will be provided with a copy of the application and all other associated materials for applicants for promotion to Levels D and E.

(163) The Division of Human Resources will make the Committee member application assessment data available at the meeting of the Academic Staff Promotion Committee.

(164) For the purposes of quality assurance and continuous improvement of the academic promotion system, the Division of Human Resources will seek feedback from applicants, supervisors, mentors and committee members at the conclusion of each academic promotion cycle.

Section 5 - Guidelines

(165) Refer to the [Academic Staff Promotion Guidelines - Applicants](#).

Status and Details

Status	Historic
Effective Date	27th April 2018
Review Date	27th April 2019
Approval Authority	Executive Director, Human Resources
Approval Date	20th April 2018
Expiry Date	8th April 2019
Unit Head	Adam Browne Executive Director, Human Resources +61 2 69332017
Author	Christine Klimpsch Manager, Workforce Planning and Strategic Recruitment +61 2 69332231
Enquiries Contact	Christine Klimpsch Manager, Workforce Planning and Strategic Recruitment +61 2 69332231 <hr/> Division of Human Resources +61 2 63384884