

Reply to Staff Consultative Group on Feedback provided in relation to the Academic Promotions Policy (and associated Procedures and Guidelines)

Note: The feedback provided by the SCG (received 10 October 2008) was based on the documents circulated to them for comment in July 2008. At the time of receipt of the SCG feedback, a significant number of updates and changes had been made to the documents.

SCG Recommendation 1 – Under Policy

- a. That the scope be clarified
- b. That the term ‘research focussed staff’ be replaced with terminology consistent with the EA and that requirements for reporting on all three elements of scholarship relating to these staff be clarified;
- c. Removal of the provision that an offer from another university at a higher level can be used to demonstrate that they have met the requirements for promotion;

RESPONSE

- (a) Updated as suggested
- (b) The reference to Research-focussed positions has been removed
- (c) We agree that staff must meet the University’s criteria for promotion in all cases but still believe we can use this test to assess whether the criteria has been met. We are at real risk of losing quality staff who have not put in an application for promotion but who meet the criteria and have demonstrated it elsewhere. Given other Universities use this procedure we are at real risk of losing a talent war without this provision. No change

SCG Recommendation 2 – Under Selection Criteria

- a. That discipline based selection criteria be established
- b. That benchmarking be carried out as part of their development

RESPONSE

- (a) The Selection Criteria provides staff with a single set of standards to guide their performance and activities. The *Discipline Report* provides the flexibility required to accommodate variance based on discipline.
- (b) See (a) above.

SCG Recommendation 3 – Under Academic Promotion Procedures

- a. That more information be provided about the competencies required for the promotion selection committee members that require them to have undertaken PDR supervisor training
- b. That all committees include a nominee of the NTEU in the roles of both independent observer and equity observer
- c. That more information be provided about what is a discipline profile, its format and its purpose.
- d. inclusion of a clause to the effect that ‘a staff member has the right to see the Dean’s comments and to respond and that the Dean’s comments will not be considered unless the staff member has confirmed that they have had this opportunity’.

RESPONSE

- (a) To facilitate alignment from appointment, probation, PDR right through to promotion, the Selection Criteria attached to the Policy will be used to inform PDR. The intention is for the PDR process to guide staff towards promotion, hence the requirement for Committee members to have at least undertaken the training.
- (b) An independent Equity Observer is to be on each Committee; no change.
- (c) Guidelines will be developed.
- (d) Agreed – the policy and procedure has been updated to require the applicant to be provided with the Dean’s comments and to make a reply, if deemed appropriate.

SCG Recommendation 4 – Under Appealing Against an Academic Promotion Decision

- a. That Chairs of Promotions Appeals Committees be selected from an agreed list (appointed in the same way as the MIC ref. EA Section 4.21.19)

RESPONSE

- (a) The MIC does not relate to the promotions process or any process to do with progression, rather it relates to a process where allegations have been put to a staff member and this, it has been argued through bargaining, requires a different level of review. The names of members of the Appeals Committee will be published at the beginning of the Promotion Cycle.

SCG Recommendation 5 – Evidence Required for Academic Promotion

- a. That it be made clear which criteria must be met for promotion

RESPONSE

- (a) The Selection Criteria have been developed to provide increased flexibility for staff and the Promotions Committee. The Learning and Teaching Centre, together with Human Resources, will provide training as appropriate.

30 October 2008