

Promotion Committee Procedures

For Academic Promotion to Levels C, D and E

These procedures will be followed by Faculty Promotion Committees (see [B/5.6](#)) and University Promotion Committee (see [B/5.5](#)) in considering and recommending for approval applications for academic promotion to Levels C, D and E (see [B/5.3](#) for the policy on Promotion for Academic Staff).

Promotion Committee members shall declare the existence of any relationship with any applicant that may lead to a conflict of interest. The role of a PPR supervisor of an applicant does not represent a conflict of interest for Promotion Committee members.

1. Eligibility Requirements

Applications will be assessed initially against the eligibility requirements provided in B/5.3.3. Where an applicant does not meet the stated eligibility requirements the Secretary of a Promotion Committee may determine, without reference to that committee, that the applicant is not eligible to make an application to the committee. The Secretary will report any such decisions to the Chair of the Committee for noting. Applicants so notified have right of appeal (see B/5.3.14).

2. Qualifications and Equivalent Accreditation or Standing

The Promotion Committee will meet to consider all eligible applications received.

The first determination is whether applicants possess the level of qualification, equivalent accreditation or standing required for the level of promotion sought. [Guidelines for Judging Equivalent Accreditation or Standing](#) are available on the Human Resources website.

Applicants will be declared unsuccessful if the Committee finds that the applicant does not possess the level of qualification or equivalent accreditation and standing required. The applicant will be notified and will be offered feedback in accordance with B/5.3.9.

Where the Committee is unable to make a decision with respect to equivalent accreditation or standing on the evidence presented by the applicant, the Committee may elect to seek additional information or clarification during an interview.

3. Rating of Applications for Shortlisting

3.1 Assessing applications

The Promotion Committee will assess an applicant's accomplishments against the [Criteria for Promotion](#). In assessing applications the Promotion Committee will take into account:

- professional and disciplinary norms;
- differences in the opportunity provided or available for career development;
- an applicant's entire academic career, but give emphasis to accomplishments during the previous five years or equivalent (breaks in career for family or other similar responsibility would be taken into account in determining equivalence), and/or since last promotion or appointment at QUT; and
- the importance of quality not just quantity of accomplishment.

In assessing applications from part-time staff, the Promotion Committee will assess quantity of output on a pro-rata basis; however, the same quality of accomplishment as full-time staff will be expected.

3.2 Evidence

The Promotion Committee will make its determination solely on the documentary evidence listed below and, where applicable, any further information provided by the applicant during an interview. Promotion Committee members shall not introduce any new information into the process unless the Committee is seeking to verify claims made by the applicant.

Documentary evidence used by the Promotion Committee is:

- Application.
- Head of school or executive dean's report.
- Applicant updates, which may be submitted prior to shortlisting and/or interview and may include a response to the head of school / executive dean report.
- Research and consultancy reports supplied by the Division of Research and Commercialisation.
- Referees reports, as determined relevant by the Committee. The Secretary of the relevant Promotion Committee may seek reports from referees nominated by the applicant as determined by the Committee at either the shortlisting or interview stage.

3.3 Rating applications

The applicant's accomplishment against each criterion will be rated out of 10 according to the following rating scale:

10 9 8	High level of accomplishment in relation to the criteria
7 6 5	Medium level of accomplishment in relation to the criteria
4 3 2 1	Low level of accomplishment in relation to the criteria

Ratings must be to the nearest 0.25.

During this stage each Committee member will allocate a rating to the accomplishments of each applicant in each criterion without consideration of the weightings assigned by the applicant to the criteria. In determining ratings, Committee members will have considered all documentary evidence available (see 3.2 above).

Where there is not consensus amongst Committee members on the ratings there will be discussion with a view to achieving consensus.

Once ratings have been assigned, a single score out of 10 is calculated by applying the weightings nominated by the applicant to the ratings for each of the criteria.

3.4 Scoring and subsequent action

Applicants other than research or teaching intensive applicants

Score	Action
Equal to or greater than 7.5, and no further clarification required	Recommend for promotion without requirement for interview
Equal to or greater than 7.5 but further clarification required	Shortlist for interview
Equal to or greater than 7 and less than 7.5	Shortlist for interview
Less than 7	Declare application unsuccessful.

Research and teaching intensive applicants

Score	Action
Equal to or greater than 8, and no further clarification required	Recommend for promotion without requirement for interview
Equal to or greater than 8, but further clarification required	Shortlist for interview
Equal to or greater than 7 and less than 8	Shortlist for interview
Less than 7	Declare application unsuccessful.

Where an application is declared unsuccessful the applicant will be notified and offered feedback in accordance with B/5.3.9.

4. Applicant Interview and Adjustment of Ratings

Applicants must be available to participate in an interview if invited by the Committee.

After interview, Committee members will be given the opportunity to alter their ratings. Where there is not consensus amongst Committee members on the ratings there will be discussion with a view to achieving consensus.

Once the ratings have been assigned, a single score for each application will be calculated by applying the applicant's nominated weightings. Applicants (excluding applicants applying on a research or teaching-intensive basis) who achieve a final score of 7.5 or above will be recommended by the Committee for promotion. Applicants applying on a research or teaching-intensive basis who achieve a final score of 8 or above will be recommended by the Committee for promotion.

5. Approvals

The relevant executive dean of faculty will approve promotions to Level C, based on the final recommendations of the Faculty Promotion Committee.

The Vice-Chancellor will approve promotions to Levels D and E, based on the final recommendations of the University Promotion Committee.