

Schedule 1 - Academic Promotions Committees

This Schedule outlines the Academic Promotions Committees' purpose, terms of reference, membership, decision-making process, and roles and responsibilities, consistent with the *Academic Promotions Policy* and *Academic Promotions Procedures*.

1. Purpose

The Academic Promotions Committees assess applications in accordance with *Schedule 3 – Academic Promotions Criteria and Evidence Guide* and make recommendations for promotion, as per the *Delegations of Authority Policy and Register*.

2. Terms of Reference

Three committees are established each year:

1. The Level E Academic Promotions Committee is responsible for assessing applications for promotion to Professor (Level E).
2. The Level D Academic Promotions Committee is responsible for assessing applications for promotion to Associate Professor (Level D). The Level D Academic Promotions Committee consists of Faculty Sub-committees to assess applications from the:
 - Faculty of Education and Arts
 - Faculty of Health Sciences
 - Faculty of Law and Business
 - Faculty of Theology and Philosophy.
3. The Level B/C Academic Promotions Committee is responsible for assessing applications for promotion to Lecturer/Research Fellow (Level B) and Senior Lecturer/Senior Research Fellow (Level C). The Level B/C Academic Promotions Committee consists of Faculty Sub-committees to assess applications from the:
 - Faculty of Education and Arts
 - Faculty of Health Sciences
 - Faculty of Law and Business
 - Faculty of Theology and Philosophy.

In the case of an application for promotion to Level B, C, or D received from an academic staff member from an organisational unit outside of a faculty, the Chair of the relevant Committee determines at which Sub-committee the application will be considered.

The Committees assess each applicant's achievements during the period of assessment in the relevant domains of academic activity.

When making assessments, the Committees consider:

- circumstances that have influenced the applicant's opportunities for achievement (see *Achievement Relative to Opportunity Guide*).
- the evidence provided in the application (see guidance on evidence in *Schedule 3 – Academic Promotions Criteria and Evidence Guide*).
- the criteria and standards, as outlined in *Schedule 3*.

To inform deliberations, a Committee may seek further information from applicants through the Executive Officer, Academic Promotions.

A Committee may, at any stage of the process, discontinue consideration of an application should it form the view that the applicant has not met the requirements for promotion.

3. Membership

Level E Academic Promotions Committee

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) establishes the Level E Academic Promotions Committee, which includes the membership described below. Quorum for the Committee is one half of the membership plus one and must include the Chair or Deputy Chair.

<i>Members</i>	<i>Term</i>
Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), Chair	Ex officio
Chair, Academic Board, Deputy Chair	Ex officio
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research & Enterprise)	Ex officio
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)	Ex officio
All Faculty Executive Deans	Ex officio
Three ACU Professors	Elected for 3-year term
Additional members to provide required expertise	Co-opted, as required
<i>Attendees</i>	
Academic Staff Observer	Elected for 3-year term
Executive Officer, Academic Promotions (Secretary)	Appointed annually

Establishing the Level E Promotions Committee's Membership:

1. Elected Members – Three academic staff with a substantive position at Level E become elected members as follows:
 - a. Members are drawn from a panel of six staff from across the University who are elected by the Level E academic staff from across the University. This arrangement allows elected members to be substituted in the case where one or more is unavailable.
 - b. Nominations and elections are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.
 - c. The term of office for elected members is three years.
2. Co-opted Members – The Chair may invite additional members from within or outside the University to ensure there is appropriate expertise to assess each application. These members participate only when the Chair determines their expertise is required. Co-opted members are not included in the meeting quorum, but their attendance is recorded in the meeting minutes.
3. Additional Appointed Members – When establishing the Committee, the Chair considers the diversity of the membership and may appoint additional members to ensure equitable representation, with particular importance placed on equitable gender representation. Additional appointed members must be current ACU staff with a substantive position at Level E.
4. Subject to the Chair's approval, ex officio members and attendees may nominate a suitable staff member to replace them for any aspect of the Committee's business.

Level E Academic Promotions Committee Member and Observer Conditions:

1. Other than the applicant's Executive Dean, members must not provide advice regarding promotion to any staff member whose application will be considered by the Committee/s on which they serve.
2. A Level D/E academic staff member elected by the academic staff from across the University attends meetings as an observer.
 - a. The observer is drawn from a panel of three staff from across the University who are

- elected by the Level D/E academic staff from across the University. This arrangement allows elected observers to be substituted in the case where one or more is unavailable.
- b. Nominations and elections are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.
 - c. The observer must not be an applicant for promotion in the same year and must be current ACU staff with a substantive position at Level D or Level E. Nominations and election are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.
 - d. The term of office for elected members is three years.
3. Observers may not speak concerning the merits of any application. They observe the process and alert the Committee, through the Chair, to any apparent departure from the university's promotions policies and/or procedures.

Level B/C and Level D Academic Promotions Committees

The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) establishes the Level B/C and Level D Academic Promotions Committees. Each committee has four Faculty Sub-committees.

For each Committee, the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) appoints a chair who serves across all four Faculty Sub-committees. The other two appointed members share Deputy Chair duties across the four Faculty Sub-committees. Each of the Sub-committees includes the membership described below. Quorum for each Sub-committee is one half of the membership plus one and must include the Chair or Deputy Chair.

Level B/C Faculty Sub-committees

Three appointed Level E academic staff are members of all four Level B/C Sub-committees.

<i>Members</i>	<i>Term</i>
Three Level E academic staff, including the Chair and Deputy Chair	Appointed annually
A Head of School from within the Faculty	Nominated annually
Two Level D/E academic staff from the Faculty	Elected for 3-year term
<i>Attendees</i>	
Academic Staff Observer (Level B/C)	Elected for 3-year term
Executive Officer, Academic Promotions (Secretary)	Appointed annually

Level D Faculty Sub-committees

Three appointed Level E academic staff are members of all four Level D Sub-committees.

<i>Members</i>	<i>Term</i>
Three Level E academic staff, including the Chair and Deputy Chair	Appointed annually
The Faculty's Deputy Dean (or Executive Dean, for faculties without a Deputy Dean)	Ex officio
Two Level D/E academic staff from the Faculty	Elected for 3-year term
<i>Attendees</i>	
Academic Staff Observer (Level B/C)	Elected for 3-year term

Executive Officer, Academic Promotions (Secretary)	Appointed annually
--	--------------------

Establishing the Faculty Sub-committees' Membership

1. Appointed Members – In consultation with the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Enterprise) and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), the Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) annually appoints three Level E academic staff to the Faculty Sub-committees. Normally, these staff are drawn from outside the faculties (e.g., from the Office of the Provost, the Offices of the Deputy Vice-Chancellors [Research and Enterprise & Education]). Collectively, the appointed members have expertise across the domains of academic activity (see *Schedule 3*).
2. For the Level B/C Committees the Executive Dean will nominate a Head of School (or another suitable Level E staff member) to serve on the Faculty's Sub-committee or they may choose to serve in this role themselves.
3. Elected Members – Four academic staff (two for Level B/C Sub-committees and two for Level D Sub-committees) with a substantive position at Level D or Level E from the Faculty become members as follows:
 - a. Members are drawn from a panel of eight Level D/E staff who are elected by the academic staff (Levels A-E) from the relevant Faculty. This arrangement allows elected members to be substituted in the case where one or more is unavailable or not eligible, due to their own application for promotion being considered in the same year.
 - b. Nominations and elections are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.
 - c. The term of office for elected members is three years.
4. Co-opted Members – The Chair may invite additional members from within or outside the University to ensure there is appropriate expertise to assess each application. These members participate only when the Chair determines their expertise is required. Co-opted members are not included in the meeting quorum, but their attendance is recorded in the meeting minutes.
5. Additional Appointed Members – When establishing the Sub-committees, the Chair considers the diversity of the membership and may appoint additional members to ensure equitable representation, with particular importance placed on equitable gender representation. Additional appointed members must be current ACU academic staff with a substantive position at Level D or Level E, usually from within the relevant faculty.
6. Subject to the Chair's approval, ex officio members and attendees may nominate a suitable staff member to replace them for any aspect of the Sub-committee's business.

Academic Promotions Faculty Sub-committee Member and Observer Conditions

1. Elected faculty members applying for promotion are **not** eligible to participate in any Academic Promotions Sub-committee in the year of their promotion application. In these instances, the Chair will select an alternate elected member from the relevant panel of elected faculty members.
2. Other than the applicant's Executive Dean, Deputy Dean, or Head of School, members must not provide advice regarding promotion to any staff member whose application will be considered by the Committee/s on which they serve.
3. An academic staff member elected by the academic staff from the relevant Faculty (Levels A-E) attends meetings as an observer.
 - a. The observer is drawn from a panel of three staff from across the Faculty who are elected by the Level A-E academic staff from across the Faculty. This arrangement allows elected observers to be substituted in the case where one or more is unavailable.
 - b. Nominations and elections are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.
 - c. The observer must **not** be an applicant for promotion in the same year and must be current ACU staff with a substantive position at Level A, B, C, D or E. Nominations and election are conducted in accordance with the *Participation of Staff in Employment Related Committees Guidelines*.

- d. The term of office for elected members is three years.
4. Observers may not speak concerning the merits of any application. They observe the process and alert the Committee, through the Chair, to any apparent departure from the University's promotions policies and/or procedures.

4. Decision Making Process – Overview

1. Staff submit their *Notice of Intent (NOI)*, which includes:
 - a. a statement about their contributions alignment with the university's Mission;
 - b. evidence of qualifications (if required);
 - c. any Achievement Relative to Opportunity (*ARtO*) Statements; and
 - d. disciplines most closely associated with their academic work.
2. The Provost and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) considers the statement about their contributions and alignment with the university's mission (see Schedule 3);
3. The Committee holds a preliminary meeting to:
 - a. assess each prospective applicant's qualifications, if required (see Schedule 3)
 - b. consider any ARtO statements.
4. The Provost's office provides applicants with decisions from the preliminary processes and invites eligible staff to apply for promotion.
5. Staff submit their application via the Academic Promotions Portal, including the mandatory and optional elements described in the Academic Promotions Procedures.
6. Heads of School/Institute Directors submit *Internal Reports*.
7. The Chair and Deputy Chair for each committee or subcommittee independently review each application and submit their ratings.
8. Applicants whose application receives an average rating from the Chair and the Deputy Chair above the '*clearly recommended for promotion*' threshold (see Schedule 3), and whose internal report confirms the accuracy of the statements in all relevant domains are recommended for promotion without further discussion.

For all other applications:

9. Appointed experts submit *External Assessor Reports*.
10. Committee members independently review each application, along with the *Reports*, then submit their ratings prior to the meeting.
11. Where the sum of each member's independent ratings for an application meet the 'recommended for promotion' threshold (see Schedule 3) it is considered that the Committee has reached a unanimous conclusion and the applicant is recommended for promotion without further discussion;
12. The Committee meets to:
 - Confirm decisions from (8) and (10)
 - Discuss applications and make a decision where there is not a unanimous pre-meeting agreement that the applicant has met the threshold for promotion.

5. Committee Decision Making Process – Detailed Descriptions

Preliminary Committee Meeting

- the Executive Officer circulates evidence of qualifications and any ARtO statement to all members
- members declare any relevant interests
- members submit their assessments of qualifications (where required) and their recommendations (max 100 words) regarding how each applicant's circumstances should be considered when assessing an applicant's achievements against the criteria and standards (see *Schedule 3*)
- the Chair, Deputy Chair, and Executive Officer review the ARtO recommendations and draft a decision
- the Chair convenes a meeting of all committee members to:
 - discuss and vote on the applicant's qualifications, if required

- review the draft ARtO decision and reach consensus.

Independent Assessments – Chair and Deputy Chair

- The Executive Officer provides the Chair and Deputy Chair with each applicant's:
 - mandatory and optional elements of the application, as described in the *Academic Promotions Procedures* (excluding the Self-Rating Form which is held by the Executive Officer and not distributed to the Committee)
- The Chair and Deputy review each application and the associated reports.
- The Chair and Deputy declare any relevant interests
- The Chair and Deputy independently rate the applicant's achievements in each relevant domain, according to the criteria described in *Schedule 3*
- The Chair and Deputy also provide a brief statement to justify each of their ratings
- Independent ratings auto-generate two overall scores; one for the Chair and one for the Deputy Chair.
- Applicants whose application receives an average rating from the Chair and the Deputy Chair above the '*clearly recommended for promotion*' threshold (see *Schedule 3*), and whose internal report confirms the accuracy of the statements in all relevant domains are recommended for promotion without further discussion.

Independent Assessments – Committee

- The Executive Officer provides each Committee member with each remaining applicant's:
 - mandatory and optional elements of the application, as described in the *Academic Promotions Procedures* (excluding the Self-Rating Form which is held by the Executive Officer and not distributed to the Committee)
 - Internal Report
 - External Assessor Reports
- Promotions Committee members review each application and the associated reports. *NB:* Assessments in the Reports are for members' information only and do not form part of the decision-making process (i.e., a committee member may submit assessment ratings that differ from those in the Reports)
- Members declare any relevant interests
- Members independently rate the applicant's achievements in each relevant domain, according to the criteria described in *Schedule 3*
- Members also provide a brief statement to justify each of their ratings
- Independent ratings auto-generate an overall recommendation from each committee member (i.e., promote vs not promote) based on requirements for promotion outlined in *Schedule 3*.
- The Executive Officer distributes to members:
 - a summary of ratings for each applicant
 - members' written comments
 - a summary of recommendations (promote vs not promote), auto-generated from the ratings.

Decision-Making Meeting

To begin the meeting, the Chair notes any interests that have been declared and explains how these interests will be managed. Members also declare any emerging interests.

When members independently provide ratings in advance of the Committee meeting that unanimously affirm a recommendation to promote the staff member, no further discussion is required. The decision to recommend promotion is recorded at the relevant Academic Promotions Committee meeting.

For applications where ratings have been made such that there is not a unanimous recommendation to promote the following process is followed:

- In the first instance, the Committee does not discuss domains where all members have selected the same rating for an applicant
- Where less than 100% but more than 80% of the members have selected the same rating, voting is by exception only. In that instance:

- the Chair notes the most frequent rating and the proportion of members that have selected that rating
- the Chair asks if the member(s) with a discrepant rating would like to raise an issue for the committee to discuss
- if no member raises an issue, members affirm their pre-meeting ratings using the electronic voting tool (see below).
- For all domains that require discussion, a structured format is followed in which:
 - the Chair leads the Committee to review the relevant criteria and standards for the relevant domain
 - the Chair reviews the summary of independent ratings and may a brief summary of the comments submitted by the members for the domain to be discussed
 - members discuss the application until the Chair affirms that all views have been canvassed and discussed appropriately
- Following this discussion, a final round of rating ensues. Members use a system that permits withholding of results until all votes are cast and non-public rating (i.e., committee members are not able to identify how another member has rated). Abstentions are not permitted (except in cases of a Conflict of Interest). For this reason, the Chair, Deputy Chair, and Executive Officer can view all members' ratings
- The voting system collates ratings and returns a final rating in the relevant domain using a 6-step process that counts the:
 1. *Votes at 5.* If a majority of the committee have given a rating of 5, then the applicant receives a 5 for that domain.
 2. *Votes at 4 or above.* If a majority of members have provided a rating below 5, then the system adds the votes for a 5 rating to the votes for a 4 rating. If this total represents a majority of the committee, the applicant receives a 4 rating for that domain
 3. *Votes at 3 or above.* If a majority of members have provided a rating below 4, then the system adds the votes for ratings of 5, 4 and 3. If this total represents a majority of the committee, the applicant receives a 3 rating for that domain
 4. *Votes at 2 or above.* If a majority of members have provided a rating below 3, then the system adds the votes for ratings of 5, 4, 3, and 2. If this total represents a majority of the committee, the applicant receives a 2 rating for that domain
 5. *Votes at 1 or above.* If a majority of members have provided a rating below 2, then the system adds the votes for ratings of 5, 4, 3, 2, and 1. If this total represents a majority of the committee, the applicant receives a 1 rating for that domain
 6. If a majority of members have provided a rating of 0, then the applicant receives a 0 rating for that domain
- If there is a tie vote at any step in this process, the Chair casts the deciding vote. The Chair's deciding rating cannot be higher than:
 - 4 in Step 2.
 - 3 in Step 3.
 - 2 in Step 4.
 - 1 in Step 5.

Where an applicant's total score across all relevant domains (i.e., the sum of all scores) falls below the threshold for promotion (see Schedule 3), the Committee holds a final vote in which they consider the entire application. Each member votes for or against promotion (see Schedule 3), with the Chair casting the deciding vote in the event of a tie.

Post-Meetings

- The minutes of the Promotions Committee meeting are approved by circular resolution by a majority of members. Once minutes have been approved, feedback is drafted for unsuccessful applicants.
- Feedback to unsuccessful applicants provides a justification for the Committee's decision and highlights the strongest aspects of the application and those aspects suggested for improvement. If an unsuccessful applicant has included an *ARtO* statement, the feedback outlines how the committee considered that statement in the decision-making process.

Note: As part of the application, applicants are required to rate their performance in each of the relevant domains. Ratings are held by the Executive Officer, and not shared with the Committee. These self-ratings will not form part of the decision-making process.

To facilitate feedback conversations, self-ratings are returned to unsuccessful applicants and their supervisors at the end of the process, along with the Committee's final ratings and summary feedback regarding achievements in each relevant domain (i.e., not the individual members' initial ratings or comments).

6. Role and responsibilities of committee members

Committee members:

1. Complete ACU's *Discrimination, Harassment and Bullying* online training before considering any portion of a staff member's application for promotion.
2. Familiarise themselves with the promotions policy and procedure, and all related documentation.
3. Apply the principles of the promotion process (see *Academic Promotions Policy*).
4. Declare any existing or emerging potential conflicts of interest to the Chair via the Executive Officer. Examples may include:
 - a. A supervisory postgraduate studies relationship (past or present)
 - b. A direct supervisory working relationship with the applicant
 - c. Co-publishing or collaborating with the applicant
 - d. A mentoring or personal relationship with the applicant
 - e. A material personal interest that may impact their ability to objectively perform in the role.
5. Provide fair and evidence-based assessments against the criteria and standards.
6. Submit their independent ratings by the due date communicated by the executive officer. Late ratings are not accepted.
7. Attend all meetings and stay for the entirety of each meeting.
 - a. If a member has a scheduling conflict it must be raised early with the Chair who works with the member and their supervisor to resolve the situation
 - b. If the scheduling conflict involves an ex-officio or appointed member and cannot be resolved, the member nominates an appropriate proxy for the Chair to consider.
 - c. If the scheduling conflict involves an elected member, a proxy is drawn from the panel.
8. During meetings, refrain from casting doubt on the accuracy of any claims made in an application. If the member has concerns about the accuracy of a claim, they must raise it with the Chair via the Executive Officer *prior* to the committee meeting. The Chair may investigate the issue further and present their findings to the committee. The Chair's investigations may include an invitation to the applicant to respond to the concern raised.
9. Treat all meeting papers and Committee deliberations as strictly confidential and respect the privacy of personal information in the application (see *Privacy Policy*).
10. For new Committee members, complete an induction session led by the Chair (or nominee) and/or the Executive Officer.

The Chair (in addition to the roles and responsibilities of members):

1. Ensures all meeting proceedings have regard for the principles underpinning the promotions process (see *Academic Promotions Policy*).
2. Determines the timing and location of meetings.
3. Considers any requests from Heads of School/Institute Directors to delegate internal report writing.
4. Determines at which Sub-committee an application is considered when submitted by an academic staff member from an organisational unit outside of a faculty (Level D/B/C only).

5. With support from the Executive Officer, assigns External Assessors for each application.
6. Determines and approves meeting agendas and minutes, and the method that is used for anonymous voting.
7. Determines how each declaration of interest is managed, which may include, but is not limited to restricting the member's involvement in a portion of the promotions process.
8. Ensures that declarations of interest are recorded in the meeting papers along with any management action taken.
9. Emphasises the importance of confidentiality of information in accordance with university privacy policies.
10. Ensures that all Committee members have input into the discussion about each applicant and that all members have adequately expressed their views.
11. Ensures that members of the Committee cast their vote at the decision-making meeting.
12. When required, casts the deciding vote.
13. With the Executive Officer, ensures that written feedback is provided to unsuccessful applicants.

The Deputy Chair (in addition to the roles and responsibilities of members):

1. Fulfills the role of Chair in the Chair's absence.
2. Supports the Chair in meetings.
3. Assists the Chair with interpretation and application of policy and procedure.
4. Oversees the committee's work to ensure it is:
 - a. in accordance with policy and procedure,
 - b. professional, transparent, timely, and
 - c. in keeping with the university's Mission and values.

The Executive Officer, Academic Promotions:

1. Publishes the Academic Promotions Timeline on the Academic Promotions webpages prior to the commencement of the annual promotions round.
2. Secures meeting dates in Committee members' diaries.
3. Manages Committee memberships in accordance with *Schedule 1 – Academic Promotions Committees*.
4. Treat all meeting papers and Committee deliberations as strictly confidential and respect the privacy of personal information in the application (see Privacy Policy).
5. Undertakes verification of each application to confirm that:
 - a. The application adheres to the requirements as set out in the *Academic Promotions Procedures*.
 - b. In consultation with the Chair, removes from an application any words or pages that exceed the limits prescribed in the *Academic Promotions Procedures* and *Schedule 3*.
 - c. The applicant meets the Workplace Behaviour and Performance Requirements as described in the *Academic Promotions Policy*.
6. Ensures Internal Reports are submitted.
7. In collaboration with the Chair, seeks External Assessor Reports.
8. Prepares and distributes timely meeting papers to Committee members.
9. Manages the voting process before and within each meeting, as required.
10. Prepares meeting minutes for approval by the Chair.
11. On behalf of the Chair, prepares the Committee's recommendations for promotion.
12. On behalf of the Chair, notifies each applicant in writing about the outcome of their application within ten days of approval (as per the University's *Delegations of Authority and Policy Register*).